

Copyright
by
Melinda Jo Spearman
2006

**The Dissertation Committee for Melinda Jo Spearman certifies that this is the
approved version of the following dissertation:**

**“The Peripatetic Normal School”: Teachers’ Institutes in Five
Southwestern Cities (1880-1920)**

Committee:

O.L. Davis, Jr, Supervisor

Sherry L. Field

Mary Lee Webeck

Lynn M. Burlbaw

Matthew Davis

**“The Peripatetic Normal School”: Teachers’ Institutes in five
Southwestern Cities (1880-1920)**

by

Melinda Jo Spearman, B.A., M.A.

Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2006

in memory of
my grandparents

Harry Spearman (1903-1986)

Lena Spearman (1905-1996)

Arthur Hagemeyer (1904-1983)

Lucille Hagemeyer (1908-2006)

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my dissertation supervisor, Dr. O.L. Davis, Jr. He has been an exceptional teacher, supervisor, mentor, and friend. I always looked forward to our long conversations in his office at The University of Texas at Austin, where he recounted rich stories and thoughtful reflections from his life as a scholar. Truly, his sage guidance has helped transform me from a student to a professor. Dr. Davis, thank you.

I am also grateful for the support shown to me by Dr. Sherry L. Field. She has influenced not only my work as an academic, but also my interactions with pre-service teachers. Dr. Field has demonstrated the importance of teaching teachers in a way that sets high-expectations, yet remains caring and respectful. Because of her friendship, I have become a stronger teacher. She will always be a trusted colleague and friend.

Dr. Mary Lee Webeck has shown me what it means to be a scholar concerned with social justice, equity and tolerance. I admire her dedication to activism and philanthropy. Dr. Matthew Davis, who knows so much about the historical foundations of education, has helped me ask and answer important questions. Dr. Lynn M. Burlbaw has helped guide me to the completion of this degree through his time, commitment, encouragement, and academic wisdom. I appreciate the way he has always valued my potential as a scholar.

I wish to thank several friends for their love and support during my experience as a Ph.D student in Education. Brenda M. Wheat and Robin Robinson Kapavik have been there every step of the way, cheerleading, commiserating and giggling with me as we navigated through doctoral candidacy. May we remain lifelong friends and colleagues.

Many thanks go to my fellow doctoral students in Curriculum Studies at The University of Texas at Austin; Betty Harrison, Vivien Geneser, Debbie Morowski and Caroline Sullivan deserve special mention. I appreciate Henry Olsen's weekly motivation and encouragement, Elliot Mollé's smiles and laughter, and Laura Bidner's enduring, long-distance friendship. Finally, of course, Sunny Mollé has shown me what it means to be an exemplary second-grade teacher, a strong woman, and a loyal friend.

While researching this dissertation, I spent many long days in archives and repositories throughout the American Southwest. Thanks go to the archivists, librarians and staff whose tireless devotion makes it possible to tell important stories from America's educational past. In particular, I would like to thank these institutions for making this dissertation research possible: The Perry-Castañeda Library, The Center for American History, The Texas State Archives, The Austin History Center, The Houston Metropolitan Research Center, The Arizona State Library Archives and Public Records Department, The Arizona Historical Society, The Phoenix Public Library, The Hayden Library's Arizona Collection, The Phoenix Museum of History, The Tempe Historical Museum The Santa Fe Public Library, The Fray Angélico Chávez History Library and Photographic Archives, New Mexico State Records Center and Archives, The Zimmerman Library, The Denver Public Library's Western History Collection, The Colorado Historical Society and The Colorado State Archives.

I appreciate the financial support of The University of Texas at Austin and Kappa Delta Pi International Honor Society in Education, two organizations that believed in this project enough to grant me fellowships for research.

In conclusion, I want to express my love to both of my parents, Ralph and Darlene Spearman. They have always been there to help make my dreams possible. Thanks, Mom and Dad.

”The Peripatetic Normal School”: Teachers’ Institutes in Five Southwestern Cities (1880-1920)

Publication No. _____

Melinda Jo Spearman, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2006

Supervisor: O.L. Davis, Jr.

This dissertation represents an investigation of teachers’ institutes in the American Southwest. Continuing professional development was, unquestionably, desirable for teachers in Progressive era schools. The teachers’ institute was a popular form of in-service education used during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, sometimes described as a “peripatetic teacher’s seminary” or a “peripatetic normal school.” Importantly, though, this form of in-service education was not a normal school. Rather, teachers’ institutes represented opportunities for free and low-cost professional development, much of which was mandatory. These institutes followed national trends and targeted local issues. Many superintendents used these meetings to push personal ideologies and teaching agendas. Certainly, institutes shaped teacher’s perceptions of their profession.

Because school districts located within major urban centers had the most extensive in-service programs, this dissertation focuses on five Southwestern cities with a high population density for the period of this inquiry. They are Houston, Texas; San

Antonio, Texas; Denver, Colorado, Phoenix, Arizona; and Santa Fe, New Mexico. Chapter one briefly summarizes the nature of teachers' institutes during the 1880-1920 period and provides a context for the individual city accounts that follow. Each of the individual accounts portray institute programs in individual cities, overview background historical context on the geographic region and explain of all forms of teacher institute programs in the area. These chapters also include a detailed portrayal of one particular type of teacher institute. Chapter two focuses on Houston city institutes, Chapter three on the San Antonio School of Methods, Chapter four on Denver summer institutes, chapter five on Santa Fe county institutes and chapter six on Phoenix joint county institutes. Chapter seven offers themes and conclusions that emerged from the research. The epilogue offers reflections and new directions for future study.

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| PROLOGUE | 1 |
| CHAPTER 1: THE TEACHER’S INSTITUTE: A PROGRAM OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION | 9 |
| The Institute as Support for Normal Schools..... | 13 |
| The Professional Rhetoric of Progressive Education..... | 17 |
| The Profession of Teaching | 19 |
| Home-Trained Teachers..... | 21 |
| The Solution: A Peripatetic Normal School | 22 |
| A Brief Historiography of Teacher Institutes | 23 |
| Teachers’ Institutes in the Progressive Era American Southwest | 28 |
| CHAPTER 2: THE CITY INSTITUTE IN HOUSTON, TEXAS | 33 |
| Types of Institutes in Houston | 37 |
| Texas Laws Governing Institute Work..... | 41 |
| Financing the Institutes..... | 44 |
| The Content and Structure of Houston City Institutes..... | 46 |
| Study Circles Within the Institute..... | 50 |
| The Institute Circular | 51 |
| Conclusions Regarding the Houston City Institutes | 56 |
| CHAPTER 3: THE SCHOOL OF METHODS IN SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS | 59 |
| Types of Institutes in San Antonio | 62 |
| Lloyd E. Wolfe: The Man and His Ideology | 65 |
| Financing the Institute..... | 68 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| The School of Methods: A Unique Wolfe Development..... | 69 |
| The Politics of Continuing Teacher Education in San Antonio..... | 73 |
| Conclusions Regarding the San Antonio School of Methods..... | 78 |
| CHAPTER 4: THE SUMMER NORMAL INSTITUTE IN DENVER, COLORADO | 81 |
| Types of Institutes in Denver..... | 84 |
| Colorado Laws Governing Institute Work..... | 90 |
| Financing the Institute..... | 92 |
| The Content and Structure of Denver Summer Normals..... | 93 |
| Teachers' Institutes and the Certification Bonus..... | 97 |
| Higher Education Credit for Institute Work..... | 99 |
| The Institute Workers' Institute..... | 100 |
| Conclusions Regarding the Summer Normal Institutes in Denver..... | 101 |
| CHAPTER 5: THE COUNTY INSTITUTE IN SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO | 104 |
| Types of Institutes in Santa Fe..... | 107 |
| New Mexico Laws Governing Institute Work..... | 110 |
| Financing the Institutes..... | 111 |
| The Content and Structure of Santa Fe County Institutes..... | 114 |
| The Teachers' Institute and Certification Examinations..... | 118 |
| The Spanish Language and the Institute..... | 120 |
| Conclusions Regarding the Santa Fe County Institutes..... | 122 |
| CHAPTER 6: THE JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTE IN PHOENIX, ARIZONA | 125 |
| Types of Institutes in Phoenix..... | 128 |
| Arizona Laws Governing Institute Work..... | 132 |
| Financing the Institutes..... | 134 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Maricopa Joint County Institutes and the Arizona Territorial Fair..... | 136 |
| The Content and Structure of the Maricopa Joint County Institute | 140 |
| Socialization at the Joint County Institute | 147 |
| The “Indian Teachers’ Institute” | 149 |
| Conclusions Regarding the Maricopa Joint County Institutes..... | 150 |
| CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS | 153 |
| Disseminating Ideas Through Institute Work: Access Versus Control | 156 |
| Plurality or Assimilation? | 159 |
| Creating Loyalty through an Esprit de Corps | 161 |
| A Carrot or a Stick? | 164 |
| The Push Towards Statehood..... | 166 |
| Myth-Breaking the American Southwest | 169 |
| Acknowledgment of the Importance of the Teacher’s Institute..... | 172 |
| EPILOGUE | 174 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 176 |
| VITA | 189 |

Prologue

Two Views of an Institute¹

Ugly teacher, petulant
Sighed, "O, Gracious me!
"Such meetings are all failures,
"But what else could they be?
"Well, I will go, I think I will,
"Just only one time more,
"And that will be my very last
"If dull as heretofore."

Pretty teacher, jollily
Said, "Well, I'll declare!
"That institute was interesting,
"I'm so glad I was there.
"I know it was a blessing
to all—and yes, to each,
"I'll always try to be there.
"Say, How did you like my speech?"

- W.F.M. 1897

In-service education has enjoyed quite a reputation among twentieth-century practitioners. Many contemporary teachers, in fact, view professional development as ineffective, a chore, or a joke. Perhaps most common is the "in-service as entertainment" conception. In this caricature, traveling actors put on an inspirational performance in a school auditorium, albeit one that appears to have little or nothing to do with actual classroom practice.² Indeed, many teachers appear to believe that

¹ Two Views of an Institute," *The Tennessee School Journal*, 3 (1897), 19. Quoted in Dick Bryan Clough "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee, 1875-1915", PhD Dissertation, Memphis State University, 1972, 119

² David E. Hunt, "Inservice Training as Persons-In-Relation", *Theory into Practice* 17.3 (1978): 239.

the most important thing in a professional development session is the sign-in sheet.³ Contemporary scholars echo this disdain that “professional development for teachers has a poor track record”.⁴ Although researchers acknowledge the importance of information, they complain that contemporary in-service programs and activities remain uninspiring. For example, the programs are commonly perceived as “too fragmented, unproductive, inefficient, unrelated to practice, and lacking in intensity and follow up”.⁵

Unsurprisingly, then, I encountered a fair amount of resistance when I began a line of research that investigates the historical antecedents of teacher professional development. Practicing teachers, when they have asked me the subject of my dissertation research, typically wince when they have heard the phrases “the history of” and “in-service education” in the same sentence. I usually received one of two reactions: one is a bored expression with glazed-over eyes, and the other is a sarcastic response along the line of, “I bet that’s *exciting*”. Educational historians and other education scholars reacted similarly. In fact, one eminent educational historian, when I told him of my dissertation topic, grinned and said, “Well . . . nobody’s going to scoop you on that one!”

Still, I maintain that most contemporary educators—both practitioners and

³ T. Corcoran, C. Passantino & G.B. Gerry, “Mapping Professional Development Opportunities: a pilot study of two subjects in three regions in Kentucky” (Lexington: Partnership for Kentucky Schools, 2001)

⁴ See, for example, Gary Hoban and Gaalen Erickson. “Dimensions of Learning for Long-term Professional Development: Comparing Approaches From Education, Business and Medical Contexts”, *Journal of In-service Education*, 30.2 (2004): 302.

⁵ Phil Riding, *Online Teacher Communities and Continuing Professional Development*, Teacher Development 5.3 (2001): 283.

scholars—will be interested to discover the nature and details of in-service education undertaken by their historical counterparts. Christopher Lucas, in his popular book on teacher education, claims that teacher institutes of the past often “seems to have resembled nothing so much as that of an old-time religious revival, a camp meeting complete with didactic sermonizing and liberal doses of motivational rhetoric”.⁶ This description embodies a popular misconception. Although some historical institutes certainly fit Lucas’ characterization; not all do. Teacher institute stories are more relevant than is their quick dismissal as fluff. In Houston, Texas, for example, teachers read, discussed, and reflected upon complex educational texts. In Phoenix, Arizona, teachers became actively involved in their communities as part of their institute programs. They participated in the annual state fair and, as well, launched a professional teachers association for Arizona.

In the wake of this nation’s current standards’ movement, one which insists on the elevation of levels of student achievement, some scholars are devoting renewed attention to the continuing professional development of teachers. The past ten years, in fact, have seen a flurry of books, edited volumes, and entire journals (e.g. *The Journal of In-Service Education*) that focus on the topic. This burgeoning literature draws upon a wide range of theoretical subfields, e.g. sociology, cognitive psychology, policy studies, and educational administration. In this direction, I argue that viewing professional development from a historical perspective holds significance for the current resurgence of interest in the improvement of teacher

⁶ Christopher Lucas, *Teacher Education in America: Reform Agendas for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997), 22.

practices. Historical knowledge about teacher professional development programs, indeed, may help explain why certain curricular and policy decisions were made and implemented in the early twentieth century. Additionally, this knowledge reasonably can serve as an important scholarly model in efforts to develop more robust understanding of continuing teacher education in any era. Most importantly, historical perspectives offer and can stimulate enriched meaning when they are shared with current educators. Simply, an awareness of history can help to foster educational change. Surely, historical knowledge of structure, content and effectiveness can be utilized to evaluate current in-service practices. Indeed, by its explorations of the beginnings of teacher institutes in American schools, this study provides the framework for subsequent studies that should trace the continuities and changes that have led to contemporary professional development programs. As John Dewey noted, history “is an organ for analysis of the warp and woof of the present social fabric, of making known the forces which have woven the pattern.”⁷

In order to craft rich and detailed portrayals of teacher institutes in individual cities, I chose to delineate this study both geographically and temporally. First, this study focuses on the southwestern United States, an area that, while not completely ignored, certainly has been undervalued in educational history.⁸ Chronologically, the study investigates in-service education between 1880, the year by which a number of southwestern cities had begun to establish in-service programs, and 1920, when

⁷ John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916) 217..

⁸ Mary Stokrocki, “Historical Research in the Southwest: Ignored and Undervalued”, *Studies in Art Education*, 42.1 (2000): 86.

teacher institutes began to decline in popularity due to a focus on less expansive, alternative forms of professional development. Because school districts located within major urban centers likely had the most extensive in-service programs, I chose to focus on the region's major cities with a high population density for the period of this inquiry. They included Houston, Texas; San Antonio, Texas; Denver, Colorado, Phoenix, Arizona; and Santa Fe, New Mexico. Subsequent studies can be expected to expand this research both temporally and geographically.

For historical inquiry to begin, primary source material must be readily available. As part of this dissertation research, I traveled to more than twenty repositories across the southwestern United States. Some of these archives were well-funded, their reading rooms filled with beautiful antique tables, ambient lighting, wireless internet, and many helpful archivists. Others manifested financial penury, complete with broken chairs, paper card catalogs, un-indexed material, and only one usually frustrated but dedicated curator available to assist puzzled patrons. Still, even in the smaller repositories, I discovered some materials that assisted in my portrayals, documentation and analysis of the history of teacher institute programs. In many cases, the material I analyzed was rich and plentiful and details about teachers' institutes surfaced in a variety of different sources. In other cases, however, my ability to make conclusions was hampered by fragmentary evidence. Simply, the extant data was not always plentiful enough to allow rigorous historical investigation and I had to modify my study accordingly. Take, for example, my decision to focus on the city of Santa Fe as a case study for New Mexico. Two other New Mexican cities, Albuquerque and Las Vegas, had significant school systems

during the period under study. Indeed, their populations were larger than Santa Fe. However, the viability of historical sources were greater in Santa Fe than in Albuquerque or Las Vegas, both in terms of quality and accessibility. Consequently, I chose to focus on Santa Fe for a historical case study in New Mexico.

Especially, annual superintendent reports became key resources for my investigation. These early twentieth-century reports detailed numerous aspects of school districts, including attention to regularly scheduled in-service programs. Importantly, several years of annual superintendent reports were available for each of the five city school systems included in this historical study. State school journals proved to be another important resource, among them, *The Texas School Journal*, *The Colorado School Journal*, *The Arizona Teacher*, and the *New Mexico Journal of Education*. Periodicals of this type usually were published to support the administration and the teaching staff of each state's public school systems. Such journals include advertisements, essays, editorials, individual school news, district and city news, and state laws and policies. I also used other relevant primary source material as available, including but not restricted to school board minutes, scrapbooks, local periodicals, photographs, personal diaries and letters, newspaper articles, city directories, and various other documents housed in archival collections that maintain records relevant to the school systems in the targeted cities.

Chapter one briefly summarizes the nature of teachers' institutes during the 1880-1920 period and provides a context for the individual city accounts that follow. Five chapters that portray institute programs in individual cities overview the historical context on the geographic region and offer explanation of other forms of

teacher institute programs in the particular area. Each of these chapters also includes a detailed portrayal of one particular type of teacher institute. Chapter two focuses on Houston city institutes, Chapter three on the San Antonio School of Methods, Chapter four on Denver summer institutes, chapter five on Santa Fe county institutes and chapter six on Phoenix joint county institutes. Chapter seven offers themes and conclusions that emerged from the research. In the epilogue, I offer reflections and new directions for study.

I have entitled this dissertation “The Peripatetic Normal School”. In several primary sources, I frequently found variations of this phrase used to describe teacher’s institutes. I like the phrase because of two special reasons. The first reason relates to the origin and meaning of the word “peripatetic”. The adjective derives from the Ancient Greek verb περιπατέω, which means “to walk”, “to wander”, and, metaphorically, “to live”. In 335 B.C.E., Aristotle’s devotees and followers were known as the “Peripatetic School”, so named due to Aristotle’s habit of walking about while teaching. The Ancient Greek noun περίπατος, which described the halls in the Athenian Lyceum where Aristotle strolled, also came to mean a “philosophical discussion” or “discourse”. For me, the possible connections between teachers’ institutes and an Aristotelian method of teaching are rich and intriguing. Would teachers’ institutes follow Aristotle’s preferences for inductive reasoning, empirical observation and practical experience? Or, would the connection between teacher’s institutes and the Peripatetic School be in name only?

Second, I believe that use of the phrase “The Peripatetic Normal School” conjures up a number of colorful and appropriate metaphors. What types of

itinerancies would the teacher's institute possess? Would it be like a bookmobile, putting information and knowledge in the eager hands of those who had no other means to receive it? Would an institute travel the country more like a peddler, selling goods to impoverished countryfolk who grab any ware regardless of quality? Perhaps it resembled a rock star tour, with famous notables blowing into town while smiling broadly and signing autographs? Maybe a three-ring circus? A traveling blood-bank? Likely, the teacher's institute was some combination of several or all these, and perhaps additional metaphors. This research, consequently, offers insight into "the peripatetic normal school" and paints a picture of the usefulness of the teacher's institute as it made its way to teachers in ways that a conventional normal school of the period could not match.

CHAPTER 1:

THE TEACHER’S INSTITUTE:

A PROGRAM OF IN-SERVICE EDUCATION

Professional development opportunities in the field of education, since their inception, have intended to help teachers gain new insights into pedagogy and to increase their teaching skills and practice. They encompass a range of activities, from the formal (e.g. planned national meetings on a specific topic) to the informal (e.g. discussions with colleagues during a campus meeting). Regardless of the setting, professional development meetings have generally involved teachers already employed within classrooms. In professional and academic discourse, the term in-service refers to teacher education during employment and the term pre-service refers to teacher education undertaken for initial teacher preparation. Although contemporary scholars debate the efficacy of specific forms of continuing professional development, they generally agree that the in-service phase of teacher education is crucial to the process of continuing teacher development.⁹ Likewise, late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century educators asserted the importance of in-

⁹ Sharon Feiman-Nemser and Janine Remillard, “Perspectives on Learning to Teach”, *The Teacher Educator’s Handbook*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996; Normal A. Sprinthall, Alan J. Reiman and Lois Thies-Sprinthall, “Teacher Professional Development”, Ed. J. Sikula, *Second Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1996): 666-703.

service education; they advocated continuing education not only for pedagogical reasons, but also justified in-service education in terms of child psychology, community involvement and teacher fellowship.¹⁰

In the nineteenth-century, *training* was the most commonly used term to describe the education of teachers. The word was used to describe education for both preparatory and practicing teachers. By the late 1930's, however, educators began to frown upon use of the word *training* in educational discourse. Former United States Commissioner of Education George Frederick Zook, for example, was one of the first to write about the negative connotations of the word, believing that “training” entailed tasks but “education” involved understanding.¹¹ The following year, Alan Valentine agreed. He opined that if teachers are only *trained*, they will only *train* children. On the other hand, if teachers continue their *education*, they will *educate* children.¹² Today, most educators continue to shun the word, training, conceptualizing *training* as a Pavlovian term that oversimplifies and “de-skills” teaching as a learned behavior; e.g. “you train dogs, not teachers”. Modern educators see training as a deficit term, implying that it holds that teachers lack both knowledge and skill.¹³

¹⁰ “Teacher Institutes”, *Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education. No. 2 1885* Washington: Government Printing Office.

¹¹ George F. Zook, “Teacher Education As I See It” *Proceedings, 1937*. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1937: pp.612-617.

¹² Alan Valentine, “Teacher Training versus Teacher Education”. *Educational Record* 19 (1938): 332-345.

¹³ Harm H. Tillema and Jeroen G. M. Imants, “Training for the Professional Development of Teachers”. Eds., Thomas R. Guskey and Michael Huberman, *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices* (New York: Teacher’s College Press, 1995): 135-136.

The term *in-service education* quickly replaced *training* as the most popular general term for continuing teacher education. Although the term rarely was used in the nineteenth century, it began to appear more frequently in the first part of the twentieth century. At first, *in-service* was used as a predicate nominative, e.g. “teachers who are in service” or “teachers that are in the service”. By the 1930’s, scholars began to use it as a hyphenated adjective, e.g. “in-service teachers” or “in-service education”. By the 1950’s, the hyphenated adjective version of the term (i.e. in-service) was the most popular use. Today, the term “in-service education” remains popular, sometimes abbreviated with the acronym INSET (In-service Education and Training).

In 1976, a major report of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education defined *in-service* as education relating to a specific program or outcome; e.g., an in-service program in reading methods or an in-service program in behavior management.¹⁴ The AACTE asserted that individual schools should be in charge of in-service programs for their own educators. In contrast, the report suggested a newly popular term, *continuing professional development*, as a different enterprise—general education for practitioners. The authors also stated that teachers themselves should be responsible for their own continuing professional development by reading professional literature or researching educational trends. This AACTE distinction between in-service and continuing professional development never gained

¹⁴ Robert B. Howsam, Dean C. Corrigan, George W. Denemark, and Robert J. Nash, *Educating a Profession* (Washington: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1976): 65.

popularity. Indeed, the two terms generally possess overlapping meanings today.¹⁵ However, the term *continuing professional development* has overtaken *in-service* as the preferred term to describe ongoing teacher education.

Today, *continuing professional development* (often abbreviated CPD) is the most frequently used term for what once was called *teacher training*. Educators prefer CPD to in-service education for several reasons. First, *in-service* is sometimes conceived as a deficit word; when contrasted with its binary, *pre-service*, it implies that some feature of initial teacher preparation is so inadequate that it necessitates further attention subsequent to the teacher's employment. *Continuing professional development*, in contrast, appears to be a growth term with connotations of continuing learning that supplements existing knowledge. Second, *in-service* frequently is perceived as passive, whereas CPD is active; with CPD, teachers are expected to develop their own knowledge. Third, *in-service* is a term that marginalizes teaching as a field. Rarely do other occupations use in-service as a descriptor for continuing education. In contrast, *continuing education* and *professional development* are commonplace in many other professions—including medicine, business and law. According to this argument, CPD helps to legitimize teaching as a profession.

Early American educators also noted the importance of continuing professional development that would target teachers already in service. “The training of teachers is a continuous function”, wrote University of Chicago professor

¹⁵ Ray Bolam and Agnes McMahon, “Literature, Definitions and Models: Towards a Conceptual Map”. Eds. Christopher Day and Judyth Sachs. *International Handbook on the Continuing*

William Gray in the early twentieth-century, “In-service training must begin at the point where pre-service training ends”.¹⁶ Policymakers and school administrators of the past professed several different justifications for the importance of in-service education: 1) to support teachers without normal school preparation, 2) to help educators become more “progressive”, 3) to elevate professionalism in education, and 4) to encourage the home-training of teachers.

THE INSTITUTE AS SUPPORT FOR NORMAL SCHOOLS

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the university and the state normal school were the two “major players” in American pre-service teacher education.¹⁷ Historians of education have helped to illuminate the importance that these institutions played in the history of pre-service teacher education.¹⁸ In particular, normal schools were the primary means of preparing teachers during the early twentieth-century. Most recently, Christine Ogren’s landmark book about the American state normal school explains how normal schools helped to enrich the initial preparation of teachers during the late-nineteenth and

Professional Development of Teachers (Maidenhead: Open University Press: 2004): 33.

¹⁶ William S. Gray, “Interrelations of Training for Service and In Service”, *Preparation and Improvement of Teachers: A Conference Report* (Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University School of Education, 1932): 52-53.

¹⁷ Wayne Urban, “Historical Studies of Teacher Education”, Ed. W. R. Houston, *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (New York: Macmillan, 1990), 64.

¹⁸ See Jurgen Herbst, *And Sadly Teach: Teacher Education and Professionalization in American Culture* (Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989); John Goodlad et al, *Places Where Teachers Are Taught* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990), Donald Warren (ed.), *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989); Christopher Lucas, *Teacher Education in America: Reform Agendas for the Twenty-First Century* (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1997).

early-twentieth centuries.¹⁹ Ogren's study, as a matter of fact, includes attention to one normal school in the Southwestern United States: Southwest Texas State Normal School in San Marcos, Texas (founded 1903).

Normal schools were able to reach 'non-traditional' students. As Ogren noted, state normal schools involved "the masses and not the classes".²⁰ In general, normal schools provided educational opportunities for students, mainly low socio-economic class women, by offering accommodating class schedules and lower tuition than did state universities that operated during the same time period.²¹ Still, not every American teacher had the opportunity to receive a normal school education.²² In 1898, Christopher Lucas estimated the number of both state and private normal graduates at less than one-quarter of all practicing teachers.²³ By 1911, the United States Commissioner of Education reported that less than half of all practicing teachers had adequate pre-service training. In many states, the number remained as low as ten or twenty percent.²⁴ During the 1906-1907 school year, for example, only eight percent of the teachers employed by the San Antonio city schools had a normal certificate.²⁵

¹⁹ Christine Ogren, *The American State Normal School: An Instrument of Great Good* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005)

²⁰ Ogren, *The American State Normal School*, 55.

²¹ Ogren, *The American State Normal School*, 201.

²² See, for example: Claude A. Phillips, The History of Teacher Training in the South. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 2.6 (1925), 322-323;

²³ Lucas, *Teacher Education in America*, 28.

²⁴ J.H. Soutemyer, The educational qualifications and tenure of the teaching population. *The School Review*, 25.4 (1917), 257-273.

²⁵ San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), *Annual Report of the San Antonio School Board* (San Antonio: Lodovic Printing Company, 1907), 17.

At least two possible reasons for these low numbers appear to be reasonable. First, state normal schools were not established at the same times in all regions of the United States. State normal schools were established by at least 1839 in the Northeastern United States. States in the Mid-Atlantic and Mid-western regions followed the example of the Northeast. Still, normal schools did not spread west of the Mississippi River until several decades later. Consequently, districts in the southwestern United States reported a paucity of normal school graduates during the early years of the twentieth century.²⁶

Second, individuals who attended a normal school had to expend personal resources. Ogren correctly asserted that normal schools offered reduced fees that encouraged the attendance of lower middle-class women and men; further, her careful research demonstrates that large portions of “normalites” came from working class-families.²⁷ Still, many more working-class educators did not attend normal schools because the costs in money and time remained too high. Although most normal schools offered financial assistance that helped reduce the price of tuition, the normal school student still incurred expenses in the form of transportation costs, room and board. Normal education also required of students a commitment of time, generally a minimum of two years for an “elementary” course of study. Such a substantial investment was something that many working-class educators could not afford.²⁸ These teachers did not receive formal pre-service teacher education.

²⁶ N. S. Cowart. Normal Schools of the New State. *The Elementary School Teacher* 8.1 (1907), 12.

²⁷ Ogren, *The American State Normal School*, 68-69.

²⁸ W.C. Rote, *Texas School Journal* 11.1 (1884), 19.

Rather, most teachers without a normal or university degree acquired teaching licensures through a “test-only” situation, taking county or state examinations for a teaching certificate.

Thus, not surprisingly, the most frequently cited justification for teacher institutes was that they supplemented and partially substituted for education provided by state normal schools.²⁹ Or, to provide education in pedagogy and content to those teachers who had no formal pre-service education in teaching at all. In 1885, the Commissioner of Education noted that: “No city can afford to employ untrained teachers”.³⁰ Early school administrators often cited poorly prepared teachers as a major causative factor in failing schools.³¹ Indeed, Walter Scott Hertzog, in his early-twentieth century dissertation research study, called unprepared teachers *the* “fundamental weakness of the public school system”.³² For many Progressive Era administrators, teacher institutes represented a local opportunity to fill gaps that “misinformed and uninformed” teacher were believed to have had in their initial pre-

²⁹ See Leo Ray DeLong, *City School Institutes in Pennsylvania*. York, PA: The Maple Press Company, 1930: 37; J. C. Tucker, “The Improvement of Teachers Already in Service” *The Texas School Journal* 34.10 (1917): 19; Herman G. Richey, “Growth of the Modern Conception of Inservice Education”, In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), *In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators: The Fifty-sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part I* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957): 35-66; Kathleen Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen: Teaching in Rural California, 1850-1950* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998): 37.

³⁰ John D. Philbrick, “City School Systems in the United States”, *Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education. No. 1 1885* Washington: Government Printing Office: 46.

³¹ See, for example: San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD). *Annual Report of the San Antonio School Board*. (San Antonio: Press of Clarke Printing Company, 1903).

³² Walter Scott Hertzog. *State Maintenance For Teachers in Training*. (Baltimore: Warwick and York, Inc, 1921), 103. Hertzog’s dissertation was supervised by William Chandler Bagley, the Teacher’s College, Columbia University professor, who advocated strong normal school education. See Wesley Null, *A Disciplined Progressive Educator: The Life and Career of William Chandler Bagley* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

service preparation.³³ Consequently, local superintendents designed institutes ‘for that class of teachers which the regular normal school cannot reach’.³⁴ Institutes enabled practicing teachers to improve their education such that they could fulfil obligations to educate children in a modern society.

THE PROFESSIONAL RHETORIC OF PROGRESSIVE EDUCATION

Most contemporary scholars find difficult a precise explanation of the progressive movement in education.³⁵ Lawrence Cremin attempted a broad characterization of the social and political movement in his ambitious history, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education*.³⁶ Although he rightly hesitated to offer a specific definition of progressivism in education, Cremin described the core of the progressive ideology as one that stressed individualism, child-centered education, democracy, self-improvement, and forward-moving progress. David Gamson argued that the debate over the characteristics of progressivism “has distracted us from a more nuanced understanding of the intriguing ways in which these reforms were implemented at the district level”.³⁷ Gamson urged historians to think of a “district progressivism”, that is, how local

³³ A.W. Eddins, “The Aims and Purposes of the Institute,” *The Texas School Journal* 25.2 (1907) 29. See also J.C. Lattimore, “Importance of Teachers Institutes,” *The Texas School Journal* 7.1 (1889), 83.

³⁴ Augusta Lawrence, “The Institute,” *The Texas School Journal* 8.3 (1890), 60.

³⁵ Herbert Kliebard, *The Struggle for American Curriculum, 1893-1958* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Diane Ravitch, *Left Back: A Century of School Reforms* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000); Wayne Urban, “Organized Teachers and Educational Reform During the Progressive Era: 1890-1920,” *History of Education Quarterly* 16.1 (Spring 1976). 35-52.

³⁶ Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education* (New York: Vintage Books, 1961)

³⁷ David Gamson, “District Progressivism: Rethinking Reform in Urban School Systems, 1900-1928”, *Paedagogica Historica* 39.4 (2003): 418.

superintendents used conflicting ideas of progressivism to push for school improvement on a local level.³⁸

Sociologist Scott Davies asserted that progressivism is a “loose” enough idea that different educational reformers have rhetorically manipulated the term at different times and in different ways.³⁹ Progressive reformers often positioned the movement in opposition to an equally nebulous “traditional education” which they painted as narrow-minded and old-fashioned.⁴⁰ This forward/backward dualism made its way into discussions of teacher education at the turn of the twentieth century. “In the United States”, O.L. Davis, Jr., wrote, “progressivism was a slogan for the new in schooling”.⁴¹ Policymakers avowed that America, as a progressive nation, must have progressive teachers.⁴² “Teaching is a progressive calling”, wrote United States Secretary of the Interior Elmer Ellsworth Brown in 1911, and “one who does not continually make efforts to go forward will soon lag behind and become relatively inefficient”.⁴³ Marching under the banner of progressivism, educational reformers justified the need for continuing teacher education as essential to a successful school system.

Often, the advocates of educational reform heralded the teachers’ institute as the means to initiate teachers into progressive ideology.⁴⁴ Advocates of the

³⁸ Gamson “District Progressivism”, 422.

³⁹ Scott Davies, “The Paradox of Progressive Education: A Frame Analysis”, *Sociology of Education*, 75. 4 (2002), pp. 269-286.

⁴⁰ Davies, “The Paradox of Progressive Education”, 282-283. See also Fred N. Kerlinger, “Progressivism and Traditionalism Basic Educational Attitudes”, *The School Review*, 66.1 (Spring 1958), pp. 80-92.

⁴¹ O.L. Davis, Jr., “Action as Part of Advocacy: Advancement of Progressive Education Practices by Professional Associations”, *American Educational History Journal* 32.1 (2005): 1.

⁴² G.W.A. Luckey. *The Professional Training of Secondary Teachers in the United States* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903), 6.

⁴³ The United States Bureau of Education, *Bulletin No 3, 1911: Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers In Service* (Washington DC: United States Bureau of Education, 1911)

⁴⁴ Laura Zirbes, “Progressive Training for Elementary Teachers: Teacher Training in Ohio”, *Educational Research Bulletin* 8.1 (1921), 250.

optimistic progressive movement noted the importance of self-improvement and growth; in turn, school districts stressed the importance of self-improvement to their practicing teachers.⁴⁵ They proclaimed that teachers needed localized meetings to facilitate such growth.⁴⁶ Policymakers, superintendents, and principals stressed these ideas through rhetoric, policy, and publicity. Thus, teachers who attended institutes were perceived as “progressive” and those who failed to attend were the “unprogressive”.⁴⁷ Incorporating this same idea into metaphor, James S. Foster, the first Territory of Dakota Superintendent of Public Instruction, compared a teacher without in-service education to “the speed of the post-boy” whereas a teacher who engaged in professional development “is to be compared with the rapidity of the telegraph”.⁴⁸

THE PROFESSION OF TEACHING

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, “professionalism” emerged as a popular buzzword in education.⁴⁹ Educational reforms strove to accord teaching a social status equal to other professions. A popular conceptualization was that a *profession*, like law or medicine, dealt with personal interaction and was built

⁴⁵ Jonathan H. Wanger, “Improvement In Service”, *Educational News Bulletin* 3.5 (1919), 4; “Proposed Program of Procedure”, 28.

⁴⁶ Emma M. Brown, “The Teacher’s Meeting”, *Sixteenth Annual Report of School District Number 1 in the City and County of Denver Colorado* (1918-1919), 123.

⁴⁷ See, for example: Brown, “The Teacher’s Meeting”, 123; State of New Mexico Department of Education, *Proposed Program of Procedure Adopted by the Administrative School Officials and Teachers* (Santa Fe: State Department of Education, 1919), 8.

⁴⁸ James S. Foster, *The Journal of the House of Representatives of the Sixth Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Dakota*. (Yankton, Dakota Territory: G.W. Kingsbury Printer, 1866). Quoted in Sandra Johnson Phillips Potter, *Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers: Dakota Territory (1861-1889) and North Dakota (1889-1911)*. Unpublished Dissertation: University of North Dakota, 1985.

⁴⁹ Thomas Popkewitz, “Professionalism in Teaching and Teacher Education: Some Notes on Its History, Ideology and Potential”, *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10.1 (1994).

upon a a set of fundamental principles.⁵⁰ Such human and ethical involvement characterizes the difference between a *profession* and a *trade*. Another important distinction relates to mastery of knowledge: a profession utilizes a special academic knowledge that differs from a skill.⁵¹ Professions, Christopher Lucas wrote in *Teacher Education in America*, “are also thought to possess arcane knowledge inaccessible to the untrained”.⁵² Many who strove to professionalize education in the early twentieth century thought that teachers’ institutes were an excellent means to achieve this purpose. Indeed, as contemporary scholar Jurgen Herbst noted, “teacher professionalism derives from the education and training that teachers receive”.⁵³

On one hand, administrators thought that nineteenth century in-service education fostered a sense of professionalism internally, that is, among teachers themselves.⁵⁴ Through regular attendance at institutes, the argument proceeded, teachers would develop an increased morale and an *esprit de corps*. Also, they would be empowered to seek new forms of pedagogy and would be freed from the isolating nature of classroom work. Teachers, by their attendance at institutes, also would begin to look upon their profession with pride, and to recognize the importance of educators in the modern world.⁵⁵

On the other hand, a number of school administrators believed that continuing teacher education would help legitimate the profession externally, for

⁵⁰ Hertzog, *State Maintenance For Teachers in Training*, 10.

⁵¹ William J. Goode, “The Theoretical Limits of Professionalism,” Ed, Amitai Etzioni, *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization* (New York: Free Press, 1969): 291-292.

⁵² Lucas, *Teacher Education in America*, 135.

⁵³ Herbst, *And Sadly Teach*, 6.

⁵⁴ Lorin Andrews, “The Report of the Executive Committee of the State Teachers’ Association for 1851”, *Ohio Journal of Education Volume I* (Columbus: Scott and Bascom, 1852): 14; S. H. Hall, “Suggestions on the County Institute”, *The Virginia Journal of Education* 3.2 (1909): 104.

⁵⁵ Samuel P. Bates, “Dignity of the Teacher’s Profession”, *Lectures on Mental and Moral Culture* (New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1873): 1.

example, in the esteem of politicians, members of the community and other professionals. At the turn of the twentieth century, physicians, lawyers and the clergy represented the pinnacle of professionalism. These fields had definite systems of continuing education, they argued, so should teaching; “The requirement of careful and exhaustive training is an essential feature of the learned professions and the tendency has been to prolong professional training in law and medicine”.⁵⁶ Because attorneys read briefs to remain current with recent court cases and physicians attend clinics to learn about new medical treatments, so should teachers attend training institutes.⁵⁷ Through institute work, school teaching could be raised “from the level of a mere empiric trade to that of a reputable profession”.⁵⁸ City, county and state superintendents kept these ideas in mind as they organized mandatory teachers’ institutes.

HOME-TRAINED TEACHERS

An additional justification for the establishment of teacher’s institutes centered upon the localization of professional development. In 1885, for example, the United States Commissioner Philbrick advocated decentralized in-service programs for city school systems. “Home-trained teachers”, he argued, were desirable because of their increased familiarity with local issues and community needs.⁵⁹ Indeed, this dictum trickled down to local administrators. “Much pressure is brought to bear on the county superintendent to employ ‘home talent’, wrote an Iowa

⁵⁶ Hertzog, *State Maintenance For Teachers in Training*, 9.

⁵⁷ Frederick Lamson Whitney, *The Growth of Teachers In Service: A Manual for the Inexperienced Superintendent of Schools* (New York: The Century Company, 1927): 8.

⁵⁸ William S. Sutton, “The County Institute in Texas” *Texas School Magazine* 10.7 (1907): 5.

⁵⁹ Philbrick, “City School Systems in the United States”, 41.

normal school principal in 1885.⁶⁰ From this perspective, a number of local administrators found local teachers' institutes to be preferable over more centralized normal school preparation.

Twenty-first century scholarship echoes this call for decentralized professional development.⁶¹ Referred to as "school-based" (single-school) or "cluster-based" (groups of schools) models, localized in-service programs have become particularly popular because of their practicality and greater opportunity for teacher leadership.⁶² Phillip Kelly and William McDiarmid, for example, in their recent study of professional development programs in Kansas, concluded with the advocacy of the decentralization of in-service education. Still, they warn educators not to "demonise workshop formats as inherently of little value".⁶³ Importantly, Kelly and McDiarmid pointed out that centralized programs carry with them an efficiency that, in an educational climate of budget restrictions and lack of time, cannot be ignored.

THE SOLUTION: A PERIPATETIC NORMAL SCHOOL

Continuing education, unquestionably, was desirable for teachers in turn-of-the-century and Progressive Era schools. Administrators pushed towards localized professional development that focused on teacher leadership and local issues. They sought to foster a sense of professionalism that would appear forward-thinking and progressive. How could school officials address all of these concerns at once? Their

⁶⁰ "Teacher Institutes", 19.

⁶¹ See J.W. Little, "Teachers' Professional Development in a Climate of Education Reform", *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15.2 (1993): 129-151.

⁶² Elizabeth Leu, "The Patterns and Purposes of Localized Teacher Professional Development Programs", *World Education U.S. Agency for International Development* (2004): 2.

⁶³ Philip P. Kelly and G. William McDiarmid, "Decentralisation of Professional Development: Teachers' Decisions and Dilemmas", *Journal of In-Service Education*, 28.3 (2002): 409-426.

solution lay in the use of the teacher's institute sometimes described as a "peripatetic teacher's seminary,"⁶⁴ or a "peripatetic normal school".⁶⁵ The teacher's institute had elements that were characteristic, at the same time, of both localized and centralized programs.

Although educators and policymakers sometimes referred to institutes as a type of normal school, they made no claims that institute programs were equivalent to preparation that teachers received in a proper normal school. Teacher institutes routinely were small and underfunded; normal schools were much larger and had more resources than did most countries and cities for the purpose of continuing teacher education. Teacher institutes were temporary, but normal schools were permanent. Still, even limited professional development was preferable to none at all.⁶⁶ The institute, more accessible and affordable than a normal school, became an essential element of many public school systems: Its value as an agency of in-service education accounted for its rapid and widespread adoption, gave it vitality to endure in recognizable form for a century, and led its proponents to exhaust superlatives in describing its beneficial effects.⁶⁷

A BRIEF HISTORIOGRAPHY OF TEACHER INSTITUTES

A comprehensive history of teacher institutes in the United States is unavailable. Even in the nineteenth-century, scholars acknowledged that information regarding the history of teacher institutes was difficult to locate.⁶⁸ Although a few historical studies exist that touch slightly upon the history of teacher institutes, a

⁶⁴ "Teacher Institutes", 10.

⁶⁵ Augusta Lawrence, "The Institute" *The Texas School Journal* 8.3 (1890): 60.

⁶⁶ Philbrook, "City School Systems in the United States", 46.

⁶⁷ Richey, "Growth of the Modern Conception of Inservice Education", 39.

⁶⁸ "Teacher Institutes", 213.

regrettable lack of published books exist that present a robust general history of teachers' professional development in the United States.⁶⁹ One notable exception is Richey's chapter, "Growth of the Modern Conception of In-Service Education", in his 1957 book. Richey made a valiant attempt to illustrate in-service education in America by describing general characteristics of institutes from their early-nineteenth century conception until they lessened in popularity during the early 1930's. In another significant study, Leo DeLong researched late-1920's city school institutes in Pennsylvania.⁷⁰ Writing during the period of institute decline, his monograph includes valuable comments from superintendents about the perceived nature and asserted value of in-service education. They noted, for example, the importance of programs that "enlarge and intensify the teachers' viewpoints".⁷¹ However, in 1930, many superintendents favored "institute substitutes" over traditional institute programs. DeLong, for instance, illustrated how superintendents began to view institutes as too expensive and eventually substituted for them less expensive forms of in-service, e.g. supervisor visitations, specialized conferences, and extension courses.

Several unpublished theses and dissertations also contribute to the knowledge of institute programs. Stone's 1951 study, although general in nature, provided an informative overview of state-sponsored institutes, but concentrated attention on professional development in the post-World War II period.⁷² Other unpublished works focused on specific states, e.g. Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Virginia, the Dakotas,

⁶⁹ See Lucas, 21-22; Donald Warren, "Learning From Experience: History and Teacher Education," *Educational Researcher* 14.10 (Dec 1985): 5-12; Goodlad et. al, *Places Where Teachers are Taught*.

⁷⁰ Leo Ray DeLong, *City School Institutes in Pennsylvania: a Study of the Development and Administration of the Program of In-Service Education of Teachers* (Camp Hill, Pennsylvania: Ell Ess Dee Educational Publishers, 1930).

⁷¹ DeLong, *City School Institutes in Pennsylvania*, 115.

⁷² Charles Stone, "The Teachers' Institute in American Education", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1951.

and Tennessee.⁷³ Of these, Clough's excellent Tennessee study appears to be most relevant to this research. Clough investigated Progressive Era institutes in Tennessee with a significant amount of care and detail. He concluded, among other things, that Tennessee teachers "benefited from the social aspect of the institute as much as from the professional knowledge gained".⁷⁴ Potter's North Dakota study also is significant to the present inquiry. Moreover, she included attention to both reading circles and state supported educational journals. Potter concluded that Dakota teachers, although physically isolated in a frontier setting with severe weather, were not isolated in terms of professional development.⁷⁵

One Master's thesis that merits attention is a 1917 study by Walter Humphreys Butler.⁷⁶ Butler, writing during the period of institute decline, focused on the county institute in Texas; thus, his study represents the only significant research on teachers' institutes with a regional focus in the American Southwest. Butler's study contained the results of a survey distributed to 183 counties in the state of Texas during the 1916-1917 school year. The counties responded with details of their annual county institutes, including dates and programs. Unfortunately, since the survey did not contain open-ended questions, the results do not include narrative comments from superintendents or teachers. Still, Butler

⁷³Louis August Andrew Lynn, "A History of Teachers' Institutes of Louisiana: 1870-1921", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1961; Carmon Ross, "The Status of County Teachers' Institutes in Pennsylvania", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1922; Marvin Maiden, "History of Professional Training of Teachers in Virginia", unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Virginia, 1922; Sandra Johnson Potter, "Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers: Dakota Territory (1861-1889) and North Dakota (1889-1911)", unpublished doctoral dissertation, 1980; Dick Bryan Clough, "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee, 1875-1915", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Memphis State University, 1972.

⁷⁴ Clough, "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee", 212.

⁷⁵ Potter, "Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers", 207.

⁷⁶ Walter Humphreys Butler, "The County Teachers' Institute," M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1917.

offered a few interesting conclusions valuable both because of the breadth of his survey and because he wrote within the context of the second decade of the twentieth-century. Butler concluded that county institutes were most effective when held early in the scholastic year. He determined that institutes should have powerful general sessions and break-out section meetings. He also believed that evening entertainment sessions were key to improving teacher social life and community. Furthermore, Butler's first chapter represents one of the only attempts at outlining a brief history of the origins of the American teachers' institute.

A few recent dissertations on other topics touch on teacher institutes, although they do not provide a significant amount of detail about them. In a study of music education in the Midwest, Pamela Stover, for example, described the musical content of county institutes in Iowa and Wisconsin. Notably, a footnote in Stover's study described how teachers at Iowa county institutes were divided into sections based on their level of teaching certificate.⁷⁷ A Teacher's College study by Elena Elster on nineteenth-century professional development is particularly interesting for her significant use of autobiography and journals.⁷⁸ Through the use of such documents, Elster portrayed several accounts of teacher professional development and placed them within a teacher knowledge framework. Although her treatment of specific teachers' institutes was terse, Elster's treatment of them included a quotation from Rhode Island institute lecturer William Mowry that supported the value of institute work. Mowry noted that teachers' institutes had "a marked influence" on his teaching.⁷⁹ Interestingly, Elster commented that "many teachers did not have the

⁷⁷ Pamela Stover "Teacher Preparation, Methods and Materials for Music Education in Rural and One-Room Schools in Selected Areas of the Midwest" (PhD dissertation, Indiana University, 2003), 105.

⁷⁸ Elena Beth Elster, "Students of Teaching: The Professional Development of the Teachers of the Nineteenth Century", PhD dissertation, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1993.

⁷⁹ Elster, "Students of Teaching", 57.

opportunity to attend these institutes”; however, she did not offer evidence to support this assertion.⁸⁰

Only a few short articles on late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century teacher institutes have appeared in academic journals. Several are particularly helpful. Harry Kersey’s research on teachers’ institutes in Michigan 1850 is bolstered by an impressive set of primary documents, specifically, journals kept by a superintendent who conducted some of the institutes.⁸¹ Kenneth V. Lottich, as part of a report about educational leadership in Ohio, treated teacher institutes conducted during the mid-nineteenth century.⁸² Lottich also portrayed how this state’s teacher’s association was formed as a result of committee work conducted in conjunction with Ohio institutes. Robert V. Bullough, Jr and Craig Kridel explored the nature of teacher workshops during the Eight-Year Study (1933-1941).⁸³ They demonstrate the importance of the individual teacher in the content and structure of the workshops. For example, participants were able to change the workshop when they were dissatisfied with the content. Notably, the Eight-Year Study workshops differed from regular teacher institutes in that they did not involve the entire teaching population of a school, a school system, or of the state. Instead, teachers applied and were “hand-picked for participation in these workshops”.⁸⁴

Missing is an extensive study that examines the history of teacher institutes from a broader geographic and chronological perspective, e.g. a particular region of the United States rather than a study focusing on a single state. Particularly, a study

⁸⁰ Elster, “Students of Teaching”, 57.

⁸¹ Harry A. Kersey, “Michigan Teachers’ Institutes in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Representative Document”, *History of Education Quarterly* 5.1 (1965): 40-52.

⁸² Kenneth V. Lottich, “Educational Leadership in Early Ohio”, *History of Education Quarterly*, 2.1 (1962): 52-61.

⁸³ Robert Bullough, Jr and Craig Kridel, “Workshops, In-service Teacher Education and the Eight-Year Study”, *Teachers and Teacher Education* 19 (2003): 665-679;

⁸⁴ Bullough and Kridel, “Workshops, In-service Teacher Education”, 673.

that focuses on the Western United States is greatly needed. David Gamson's dissertation on educational reform in the urban West, represents an excellent model for such a study.⁸⁵ He investigated reform in four Western cities during the Progressive era. After examining each city's reform efforts individually, he analyzed the evidence in order to explore themes and questions that emerged from the reform movements in all four urban areas. The present study follows Gamson's successful model and uses historical case studies of five Southwestern cities in order to investigate the nature and practices of teachers' institutes in these cities' schools.

TEACHERS' INSTITUTES IN THE PROGRESSIVE ERA AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

The geography of the southwestern United States played an important role in the region's educational development. This region exhibits small pockets of population that are separated by vast distances. Yet, despite remoteness from the industrial Northeast, migration access to the Southwest was relatively easy for English-speaking settlers.⁸⁶ The Anglo settlers were imitative of those of the Northeast and Midwest, establishing public school systems that operated on a New England model.⁸⁷ Still, the conflict between replication of American class structure and Western frontier identity resulted in conflicting influences in Southwestern educational communities.⁸⁸ For example, tension existed between the idea of a homogenous culture of "pioneers" and the racial and class divisions that persisted in the United States as a whole.⁸⁹ A conflict also existed between the autonomous

⁸⁵ David Gamson, "District by Design: Progressive Education Reform in Four Western Cities, 1900-1940", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 2001.

⁸⁶ Herschel T. Manuel, *Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and Public Welfare* (Austin: The University of Texas, 1965): 10.

⁸⁷ Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen*, 37.

⁸⁸ Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen*, 81.

⁸⁹ Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen*, 123.

Western woman and the patriarchal assumption of “continued male control of women teachers’ work”.⁹⁰ Women, particularly those in the American West, held positions of educational leadership at the local, county and state levels during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.⁹¹ Teachers’ institutes provided another outlet for women to take leadership roles in the field of Education. Still, with the notable exception of the state of Colorado, upper-levels of school administration remained male-dominated. In some ways, then, institutes exhibited a tendency to empower women teachers and teachers of color; in others, they replicated gender and racial inequality.

State normal schools were established later in the Southwest than in other regions of the United States, a possible reason being the dispersion of states’ population. Texas, for example, established its’ first normal schools in 1878. Arizona normal schools began in 1886, while Colorado normal schools started in 1890. New Mexico established normal schools later than other Southwestern United States, in 1898.⁹² Still, school systems in these states were operational before these times. In the absence of established normal school systems, these areas were desperately in need of teachers.⁹³ Consequently, institutes were of special importance in the education of teachers in the American Southwest; “When normal schools are few and small or where they have not yet been founded, the institute

⁹⁰ Weiler, *Country Schoolwomen*, 123. See also, Michael Apple, *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education* (New York: Routledge, 1989), 65.

⁹¹ See Jackie M. Blount, *Destined to Rule the Schools: Women and the Superintendency, 1873-1995* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998); Lynn M. Burlbaw, Heather Caldwell, Jennifer Moldonado-Castillo and Michelle Fernandez, “The Superintendent Project: Women Educators as State Superintendents of Public Instruction”. Paper presented at the Midwest History of Education Society, October 21-22, 2005, Chicago, Illinois.

⁹² Ogren, *The American State Normal School*, Appendix.

⁹³ “Meeting the Demand for Teachers in the West,” *The Rocky Mountain Educator*, 15.3 (1909): 44.

must acquire at once much greater importance as an educational training appliance.”⁹⁴

Vast distances also made communication difficult during the late nineteenth-century. The separation of rural teachers in small pockets of population increased the value of the teacher’s institute as a vehicle by which to spread educational ideas to isolated practitioners. However, industrialization issued a series of massive changes in American society at the turn-of-the-century. As communication improved during the first few decades of the twentieth-century, teachers’ institutes diminished in importance. One superintendent, responding to DeLong’s research study on Pennsylvania city institutes, succinctly explained the situation: “There was a time when institutes were vital. The radio, vitaphone, magazines and especially advancement in teacher training have eliminated many reasons for demanding the old time institute.”⁹⁵

The accounts in this study help tell the story of teacher’s institutes in several cities of the American Southwest during the Progressive Era from 1880-1920. Importantly, this research presents an urban story only. Many contemporary historians of the American West have encouraged scholars to consider the region an urban civilization. “Throughout the past one hundred years,” Historian Gerald Nash explained, “some historians of the West have sought to find a key to understanding it by studying its towns and cities rather than its more sparsely populated areas”.⁹⁶ Indeed, late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century reformers characterized urban school districts as places on “the leading edge of planned educational change”.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ “Teacher Institutes”, pp. 9-10.

⁹⁵ DeLong, *City Institutes in Pennsylvania*, 120.

⁹⁶ Gerald D. Nash, *Creating the West: Historical Interpretations: 1890-1990* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991) 159.

⁹⁷ Gamson, “District By Design”, 4.

Texans “looked to the cities”, particularly Houston, Galveston, Austin and San Antonio, for developments in art, news, society and industry.⁹⁸ Denver, a gold rush city that grew quickly, represented an intellectual center in the Rocky Mountains.⁹⁹ In Arizona and New Mexico, urban centers still heralded progress, though on a smaller scale. Certainly, Phoenix and Santa Fe developed more slowly than Denver, Houston and San Antonio. Still, these two Southwestern cities represented important bastions of growth, and “accompanied or preceded the opening of the surrounding country”.¹⁰⁰ Cities, then, experienced the most intense institute programs in the American Southwest. Consequently, urban areas are an ideal focus for this study of teachers’ institutes during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Although many rural areas in the American Southwest made provisions for teachers’ institutes, not all did. Some teachers, particularly those in rural districts with a strong transportation infrastructure, journeyed to larger cities for institute work. Other teachers, particularly those in isolated rural districts, did not have an opportunity for institute work. An investigation of rural teachers’ institutes is another story; hopefully, a story that will follow this research.

This research study investigates three main research questions. 1) What did the structure and/or the content of teachers’ institutes look like? 2) How accessible were these institutes to public school teachers and what role did they play in their professional development? 3) What themes and conclusions arise regarding the function and the purpose of teachers’ institutes? Responses to these questions are generated through a detailed investigation of teachers’ institutes in five Southwestern

⁹⁸ Bradford Luckingham, “The Urban Dimension of Western History.” In Michael P. Malone, *Historians and the American West*. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983) 327.

⁹⁹ Gunther Barth, *Instant Cities: Urbanization and the Rise of San Francisco and Denver* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1975).

¹⁰⁰ Luckingham, “Urban Dimension of Western History,” 335.

cities throughout the Progressive era: Houston, Texas; San Antonio, Texas; Denver, Colorado; Santa Fe, New Mexico; and Phoenix, Arizona.

CHAPTER 2:

THE CITY INSTITUTE IN HOUSTON, TEXAS

Finances of the State of Texas were in shambles at the close of the Civil War. The state had few financial resources and a paltry school fund.¹⁰¹ In 1870, ten years after the disastrous war, the United States Bureau of Education reported that Texas “was in the darkest field educationally in the United States”.¹⁰² Across the next thirty years, public education in Texas only slowly improved. Much of this advancement came with help from three sources: 1) the Peabody Fund, a massive trust established to support Southern schools after the Civil War¹⁰³, 2) the leadership of Governor Oran M. Roberts (1878-1883), an administrator for whom fiscal reform held an extremely high priority¹⁰⁴, and 3) the labors of O.L. Hollingsworth, a Democratic State Superintendent of Education (1874-1875).¹⁰⁵ In 1900, however, the state of Texas remained “below the average of the United States as a whole”, ranking 38th among the states in terms of the general state of its school system.¹⁰⁶

Texas counties at the turn-of-the-century contained individual (common or

¹⁰¹ Donna Lee Younker, “Teacher Education in Texas, 1879-1919” (PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1964), 61.

¹⁰² Younker, “Teacher Education in Texas”, 61.

¹⁰³ See, for example, Peabody Education Fund, *Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund from Their Original Organization on the 8th of February, 1867, Vol 1.* (Boston: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1875), 3.

¹⁰⁴ See, for example, A. Christian Klemme, “The Rise, Fall and Redemption of Oran M. Roberts” (MA thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2004)

¹⁰⁵ Frederick Eby, *The Development of Education in Texas* (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925).

¹⁰⁶ Eby, *Education in Texas*, 220.

rural) school districts under the administration of county school superintendents and county school boards. Importantly, cities and towns could form their own separate (or independent) school districts with their own school boards; city superintendents led these municipal districts.¹⁰⁷ Texas cities like Houston and San Antonio, for example, chose to incorporate into city school districts. Local taxation supported both the county and city school systems.

Despite the dwindled finances of the public school system in Texas, administrators and policymakers considered as prime importance the professional development of the Texas teaching corps. This was in part due to the efforts of Dr. Barnas Sears, the first Peabody Fund agent to visit the state of Texas. Sears was general agent of the fund from 1867 until his just before his death in 1880. In 1877, he reported that teacher institutes (throughout the South) were “indispensable. Otherwise, the public schools will be but a farce”.¹⁰⁸ Sears’ strong statement stemmed from his belief that teachers, without a widespread normal school system, would continue to possess a general lack of pre-service education and experience.¹⁰⁹ Through regularly scheduled teacher institutes, superintendents could guide and support the daily work of teachers. Other Texas educators of the time agreed with

¹⁰⁷ J. J. Lane, “History of Education in Texas”, *United States Bureau of Education Circular of Information No. 2, 1903* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1903): 36-37.

¹⁰⁸ Peabody Education Fund, *Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund from Their Original Organization on the 8th of February, 1867, Vol 2*. (Boston: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1875), 115

¹⁰⁹ Peabody Education Fund, *Report of the Peabody Agent Vol. 2*, 710.

Sears,¹¹⁰ even complaining that, without regularly scheduled professional development, teachers entering the profession would be like “a militia of home talent of no definite training”.¹¹¹

In the late nineteenth-century, Houston was the third most populous Texas city, behind Galveston and San Antonio. The Houston city school district served several thousand students. In 1890, for example, 66 teachers taught 3544 pupils in 13 different schools.¹¹² The city grew slowly during the last decade of the nineteenth century, when it served primarily as a trans-shipment river support base for the larger city of Galveston.¹¹³ By the-turn-of-the-century, however, Houston had established a reputation as progressive city independent of Galveston, with electric street lights, trollies, and a nationally-recognized sewage disposal system. Houston’s growth spurt came in the first few decades of the twentieth-century. By 1910, 25 schools housed 12, 151 students and 296 teachers.¹¹⁴ In 1930, Houston eclipsed both Galveston and San Antonio in terms of population. It was during this period of growth that Houston gained recognition as a worthy model for Texas education.

When the city of Houston opened the doors of free public schools on October 1, 1877, and throughout most of the twentieth century, African-American students

¹¹⁰ See, for example, J. Tucker, “The Improvement of Teachers Already In Service.” He writes that, in 1917, “only 15 per cent of the teachers in the United States have had a normal school training”. Also, I. Bryant, Jr, *The Development of the Houston Negro Schools* (Houston: Informative Publishing Company, 1934): 42

¹¹¹ Z.T. Fulmore, “Our Public Schools” (Austin, TX: unpublished paper, April 2, 1886). From AISD Scrapbooks of Clippings, Programs 1881-1953 11 volumes FP D.3 V. at the Austin History Center, Austin, TX.

¹¹² Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1890-1891.

¹¹³ “Urbanization”, *The Handbook of Texas Online*.

< <http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/UU/hyunw.html> > (date accessed 17 April 2006).

¹¹⁴ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1909-1910.

attended segregated schools. The Texas constitution of 1869 stipulated this segregation, which meant in practice, separate schools for black and white children.¹¹⁵ From the outset, the Houston city schools employed African-American principals and teachers for its colored schools. Two African-American principals, Henry C. Hardy and C.E. Johnson, worked for the school district during its inaugural year; notably, these principals initially received the same salary as did their counterparts in the white schools.¹¹⁶ During this same school year, the Houston public schools employed 14 white teachers and 14 black teachers.¹¹⁷ Houston teacher institutes, following the pattern of school organization, were segregated by race into a white section and a colored section at the county, city, and grade level meetings.

Children of Mexican origin were classified as “white” by the state of Texas.¹¹⁸ The city of Houston had inhabitants of Mexican origin; for example, in 1930, seventy-five thousand Texas Mexicans lived in Houston.¹¹⁹ However, teachers of Mexican origin were not employed by the Houston city schools until the 1960’s.¹²⁰ Thus, most teachers of Texas Mexican children were Anglos who attended white teacher institutes.

¹¹⁵ Lane, “History of Education in Texas”, 45.

¹¹⁶ Johnny Johnson, “African American Leadership from 1876-1954: A Study of an Urban School District” (E.ed Dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1993) 21, 25. By 1893, however, African-American principals made a considerably lower salary than white principals.

¹¹⁷ Johnson, “African American Leadership”, 25.

¹¹⁸ Matthew D. Davis and O.L. Davis, Jr., “Elma Neal, The Open Door Readers, and Mexican American Schooling in San Antonio, Texas,” *American Educational History Journal* 28 (2001): 21.

¹¹⁹ Guadalupe San Miguel, *Brown, Not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston* (College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001):4.

¹²⁰ G. San Miguel, *Brown, Not White*, 14.

Hildreth H. Smith, the first superintendent of the Houston schools from 1877 until 1879, was reported to have organized weekly city teacher meetings during its inaugural year. The city placed a special emphasis on professional development, stressing “the continued growth of the teacher after she enters the service, even more than her preparation before she enters the work”.¹²¹ In fact, Houston city superintendent Paul W. Horne stated that he would prefer a motivated high school graduate rather than a university graduate who was uninterested in professional development.¹²² This focus on professional development continued throughout the early twentieth century and, eventually, Houston earned the reputation as the city with the best institutes in the state of Texas.¹²³

TYPES OF INSTITUTES IN HOUSTON

The state of Texas had a well-developed system of summer normal institutes by 1883.¹²⁴ Despite the implications of their name, these normal institutes were not officially associated with normal schools, teacher colleges, or university schools of education. The word *normal* may have been used to imply a non-existent association with normal schools for reasons of legitimacy. Or, it may have been a derivation from the Latin word *norma*, meaning “rule” (i.e. a normal institute gave educators the rules for teaching). At any rate, summer normals were state authorized, regulated and administered by the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. Texas held

¹²¹ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Independent School District of Houston*, 1911-1912, 22.

¹²² Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1911-1912, 22.

¹²³ “Editorial”, *The Texas School Journal* 14.3 (1896): 100.

¹²⁴ “Summer Normal Schools”, *Texas School Journal* 1.6 (1883), 111.

summer normals in each senate district for white teachers, and in each congressional district for African-American teachers.¹²⁵ The State Superintendent designed the summer normal system to “bring normal teaching and normal methods sown to the teachers in the several localities of the state, so that they may enjoy its benefits without loss of time”.¹²⁶ Although Texas policymakers designed the summer normal system designed to reach both rural and city teachers, not all teachers had the ability to attend summer programs.¹²⁷ Summer normal institutes carried tuition fees which many teachers could not afford.¹²⁸ The tuition was set at five dollars, although institutes could charge additional fees as appropriate.¹²⁹ Furthermore, they continued for a minimum of five weeks. Consequently, participating teachers also had to pay costs in terms of room, board and travel. The city of Houston was not a summer normal site for white teachers.¹³⁰ Presumably, white Houston teachers interested in summer normal work attended programs in the adjacent Brazoria County. Because these state-sponsored summer institutes were optional and required travel, many white Houston teachers chose not to attend. Importantly, Houston regularly housed a summer normal for colored teachers. Since the colored summer institute was within the city limits, it was likely an accessible form of professional development for African-American teachers in Houston.

In 1877, the Texas created a system of county superintendents. Each of these

¹²⁵ “News and Notes”, *Texas School Journal*, 3.2 (1885), 38.

¹²⁶ “Summer Normal Institutes”, *Texas School Journal* 2.1 (1884), 19.

¹²⁷ J. B. Haston, “Opinion”, *Texas School Journal* 19.8 (1902), 305-307.

¹²⁸ B.B. Haley, “Correspondence”, *Texas School Journal* 11.10 (1884), 305-306.

¹²⁹ “Summer Normal Regulations”, *Texas School Magazine*, 6.3 (1903), 25.

¹³⁰ See, for example, “First Series of Summer Normals” and “Second Series of Summer Normals”, *Texas School Journal* 20.1 (1902), 10-11.

superintendents was charged with a variety of administrative and clerical duties, but all were required to organize a yearly county teacher institute. These institutes, like the summer normals, ran throughout the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. A superintendent who failed to hold the institute according to state law could be removed from office.¹³¹ Additionally, the county superintendent had the power to cancel the certificate of any teacher who failed to attend the institute.¹³² Houston teachers attended county institutes in Harris County, which had a far greater attendance rate than did the summer normals.¹³³ County institutes were usually held for one week in September or during a holiday period in December or January; or, alternatively, split into sessions that were held on three non-subsequent weekends during the scholastic year. Generally, Harris county superintendents chose to split the institute work into three weekends.¹³⁴

In addition to county institutes, many Texas city school districts decided to hold local institutes that were sponsored by their city superintendents. Administrators conceptualized these local institutes as an extension of county institute work, scheduled regularly and on a more frequent basis.¹³⁵ Additionally, the smaller setting allowed for increased opportunities for group work, teacher leadership and active participation.¹³⁶ In Houston, institutes were at first bimonthly,

¹³¹ J.M. Carlisle, "County Institutes," *The Texas School Journal* 11.11 (1893): 362.

¹³² R.B. Cousins, "The Institute Work for 1907-1908", *Texas School Magazine* 10.7 (1907): 11.

¹³³ Carl Hartman, "Local Institutes", *Texas School Magazine* 11.8 (Nov 1907), 8.

¹³⁴ "Harris County Teacher's Institute", *Texas School Journal* 23.5 (1906), 27.

¹³⁵ Hartman, "Local Institutes", 8-9; "Minutes of the County Superintendents' Institute held in Austin, Texas, August 4th and 5th, 1908", reprinted in *Texas School Magazine* 12.7 (October 1908): 15.

¹³⁶ A.R. Liddell, "Local Institutes," *The Texas School Journal* 20.6 (Dec 1902): 269-270.

then monthly beginning in 1889.¹³⁷ Teachers attended the first institute of the year on the Saturday before the opening of schools. The institutes generally continued, one each month, for the duration of the scholastic year. Occasionally, teachers in the cities of Houston and Galveston met together for joint city institutes.¹³⁸ Teachers from both cities attended these joint institutes which focused mainly on regional problems.¹³⁹ The Galveston sessions deviated somewhat from the regular Saturday institute format; they were generally several hours longer and often featured entertainments by schoolchildren from the host district.

Houston city teachers also had the opportunity to attend grade level meetings held with the superintendent.¹⁴⁰ City superintendents generally had the latitude to structure their institutes in any manner. Houston city superintendent William Seneca Sutton (1887-1896) believed that these meetings were important because of their emphasis on classroom issues. "In some respects grade level meetings are of more practical, specific value than the monthly institutes", Sutton explained, "from the fact that the work, or usually a portion of the work, of only one grade is considered at each meeting, and is discussed by all the teachers of that grade".¹⁴¹ Later, Sutton mandated teacher attendance and stopped attending the meetings. Instead, he appointed leaders to conduct the grade level meetings.¹⁴² The grade leaders prepared

¹³⁷ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1889-1890, 20.

¹³⁸ Galveston Public Schools, *Tenth Annual Report, June 30, 1892*, 12; Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1892-1893, 20.

¹³⁹ Katherine Keller, "A History of Public Education in Texas" (M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1930), 51.

¹⁴⁰ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1889-1890, 21.

¹⁴¹ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1889-1890, 21.

¹⁴² Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1900-1901, 37.

programs and sent them to teachers in advance of the session. Most of these programs were quite specific (e.g. “How to Teach the Surface of North America” or “Articulation: How to Stop Falling Inflection at Commas”).¹⁴³ In 1901, city superintendent William Barnett explained such a narrow focus by saying that “the grade meetings should not attempt too wide a range of discussion. It is better to narrow the discussion and deepen it rather than to have a shallow discussion of a broad topic”.¹⁴⁴ These city institutes were officially optional; still, most superintendents of city schools personally insisted that their teachers attend. Although the Texas state legislature never officially mandated teacher attendance at city institutes, the legislature did regulate attendance for county institute work.

TEXAS LAWS GOVERNING INSTITUTE WORK

At first, Texas laws mandated only that each county hold some form of institute—without specifications concerning the frequency or length of institutes, or regulation of teacher attendance.¹⁴⁵ Many administrators lobbied for more stringent requirements that would make teacher presence at county institutes compulsory.¹⁴⁶ *The Texas School Journal*, the leading educational periodical in Texas during the Progressive Era, suggested that teachers who failed to attend the institutes should have a sum deducted from their salaries and be forced to retake all certification

¹⁴³ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1893-1894, 31

¹⁴⁴ Houston Independent School District, *Annual Report*, 1900-1901, 37.

¹⁴⁵ Chapter 25, Section 42 of the Eighteenth Legislative Session of the State of Texas. From H.P.N. Gammel, *The Laws of Texas 1922-1897* (Austin: Gammel Book Company, 1898).

¹⁴⁶ For example, J.L. Henderson, “County and City Institutes,” *The Texas School Journal* 20.3 (Sept 1902): 76.

examinations.¹⁴⁷ Although the journal's suggestion never came to fruition, administrators like Robert Bartow Cousins, who was both State Superintendent of Public Instruction (1905-1910) and Superintendent of Houston Public Schools (1921-1924), continued to push for legislative efforts that would mandate teacher attendance. In 1897, Cousins complained that the fact that institutes were "practically voluntary" caused many programs to be "failures".¹⁴⁸

The legislature eventually began to regulate attendance. In 1905, state legislation mandated teacher attendance at county institutes and county superintendents received permission to revoke the teaching certificate of any teacher who failed to attend. Furthermore, teachers could attend institutes that were scheduled during the school year without a loss of salary.¹⁴⁹ This same legislature also granted to the State Superintendent and his assistants traveling expenses for county institute attendance.¹⁵⁰

Institutes, both county and local, were open to teachers of all grade levels. In 1911, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Francis M. Bralley (1909-1913) required that county institutes with more than thirty teachers split into grade level sections for a portion of each day.¹⁵¹ In most cases, teachers attended sessions which focused specifically on work at primary, intermediate and high school grade levels.

¹⁴⁷ "Editorial," *The Texas School Journal*, 5.6 (June 1887): 169-170.

¹⁴⁸ Robert Bartow Cousins, Sr, Papers 1861, 1894-1933. Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin.

¹⁴⁹ R. B. Cousins, "Digest of the Law Governing Certificates of Teachers," *The San Antonio Express*, June 4, 1905.

¹⁵⁰ L.A. Woods and S. B. McAlister, *Public School Laws* (The State of Texas, 1938): 15-16. Article 2658, Chapter 124.

¹⁵¹ F.M. Bralley, "County Institutes," *The Texas School Journal*, 29.1 (September 1911):33.

Notably, the State Superintendent regulated the content of the county institutes. Each year, the State Department of Education issued guidelines for county institute proceedings that included themes, topics of study, and recommended professional textbooks.¹⁵² Additionally, *The Texas School Journal* published suggested programs based on the state guidelines, including time allotment and session details.¹⁵³ County superintendents who failed to follow the guidelines were labelled ‘monopolists’ and were accused of ‘the inbreeding of local pedagogical ideas’.¹⁵⁴ By the 1907-1908 school year, as an enforcement of the state’s content standards, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction requested that each county submit institute programs to the State Department of Education in advance for pre-approval.¹⁵⁵

While the Texas Legislature issued laws concerning teacher attendance and institute content, policymakers were slower to pass regulations that would provide financial support for the professional development of teachers. Although the Texas Legislature appropriated funds to support the system of summer normal institutes for their first three years in operation, the summer normals did not receive financial support from the state subsequent to 1886. Furthermore, county and city institutes never received monies from the state.

¹⁵² Bralley, County Institutes, 32-34.

¹⁵³ For example, see “Suggested Programs for County Institutes”, *The Texas School Journal* 15.9 (1897): 286-288.

¹⁵⁴ See “Suggested Programs” 1897; H.T. Musselman, What of the county institute in Texas, *The Texas School Journal* 34.3 (1916): 25-36.

¹⁵⁵ R.B. Cousins, “The Institute Work for 1907-1908”, *Texas School Magazine* 10.7 (1907): 13.

FINANCING THE INSTITUTES

Many of the state's educators considered the failure of the Texas legislature to financially support institutes a serious act of disregard. Legislators believed that the summer normal system should be "self-sustaining"; that is, "tuition fees collected from those who attend must defray the expenses of the schools".¹⁵⁶ Those who favored state financial support for the summer institute system offered several possible alternative funding options. Some of the ideas included asking the host town to furnish money to support the institute, mandating that all practicing teachers donate one dollar regardless of their attendance, appropriating funds from the state legislature, and attaching additional institute fees to certification examinations.¹⁵⁷ Opponents chastised teachers for wanting money for normal institutes, citing, for example, the Biblical story of Solomon; that is, if a teacher sought wisdom first, riches and fame would follow.¹⁵⁸ Other opponents suggested that the districts offer joint summer normals in order to increase "efficiency".¹⁵⁹ Ultimately, the legislature never appropriated funds for the summer normal system. Indeed, according to a report by State Superintendent of Public Instruction Walter Doughty (1913-1919), teachers spent nearly \$300,000 of their own money for expenses related to the cost of

¹⁵⁶ J.S. Kendell, "Summer Normal Schools", *Texas School Magazine*, 2.11 (1899), 22.

¹⁵⁷ W.E. Taylor, "A Word About Summer Normals", *Texas School Magazine*, 13.9 (1911), 7; R. B. Cousins, "Teachers' Institutes and Summer Normal Schools", *Texas School Magazine* 7.10 (1905), 10.

¹⁵⁸ W.W. Barnett, "The Purpose of the Summer Normal", *Texas School Journal*, 19.9 (1902), 305-306.

¹⁵⁹ Kendell, "Summer Normal Schools," 22.

their attendance at Texas summer normal sessions during the summer of 1915.¹⁶⁰ These teachers represented only a small portion of all Texas teachers.

Individual Texas teachers also spent personal funds to cover county normal institute fees, although tuition was generally only one dollar per scholastic year. Like the summer normal situation, administrators across the state disapproved of charging any county institute tuition.¹⁶¹ Furthermore, Brazoria County Superintendent Jesse W. Saxon (1898-1902) believed that teachers should receive their usual salaries during institute attendance; that is, “a day spent attending an institute held by the superintendent—county or city—should be considered a school day in estimating a teacher’s pay”.¹⁶² County Boards of Education possessed the authority to appropriate financial resources to support their own institutes, especially when they wished to fund a stipend for a visiting lecturer.¹⁶³ Some counties creatively sought funds. For example, one superintendent asked for donations from local businessmen and assessed a one percent cut in the monthly salaries of all teachers.¹⁶⁴ Towards the end of the first decade of the twentieth-century, the Texas State Legislature required that county trustees pay teacher salaries for time spent during county institute work.¹⁶⁵ Importantly, however, the state never provided funds for county institutes.

¹⁶⁰ William Doughty, *Recommendations Regarding Public Education in Texas for Consideration of The Governor of Texas and the 34th Legislature* (Von Boeckmann-Jones, CO Austin Printers, 1915).

¹⁶¹ “Publisher’s Notes and Editorials”, *Texas School Magazine*, 2.11 (1899), 20-21.

¹⁶² “Publisher’s Notes and Editorials” 1899, 22.

¹⁶³ H.T. Musselman, “What of the County Institute”, *Texas School Magazine* 33.1 (1915), 10.

¹⁶⁴ “Superintendent Bradford’s View of This Kind of An Institute”, *Texas School Magazine* 33.1 (1915), 33.

¹⁶⁵ “The Institute Work for 1907-1908”, *Texas School Magazine*, 10.7 (1907), 11.

In some cases, teachers defrayed costs of city institutes. Houston teachers, for example, had to obtain their own copies of any texts studied over the course of a year's city institute. To help, superintendents sent teachers a list of Houston vendors who had copies of the required books for sale. The list included sample prices. For the 1907-1908 school year, for example, the book chosen for study carried a price of fifty cents.¹⁶⁶ The superintendent also asked teachers to contribute to the cost of hiring inspirational speakers:

As announced before, an effort will be made to secure some able speaker on some educational topic for each session of the institute this year. It will be necessary to pay the expenses of these speakers, and it is believed that the teachers will cheerfully make some small contribution to cover these expenses.¹⁶⁷

Accordingly, many Houston city teachers contributed their own finances for institute work at the state, county and city levels. State summer normal attendance was optional, so not all Houston teachers spent money for summer work. At the required county institute, Houston teachers paid one dollar each year. Since Houston superintendents believed that attendance at city institutes was a duty, Houston teachers also spent money for city institute books. Thus, a Houston teacher who did the minimal amount of institute work each year spent around two dollars a year in tuition and materials. The exact amount, of course, depended upon the books chosen for study at the local city institute.

THE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF HOUSTON CITY INSTITUTES

For the most part, Houston city institutes followed a similar scheduling pattern

¹⁶⁶ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 302.

¹⁶⁷ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 302-303.

during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. Houston teachers spent the first part of their city institute in a general session, with all teachers in attendance. The general lecture was most often delivered by the city superintendent or a noted speaker from outside the school system. Superintendent Paul W. Horne (1904-1921) thought that these types of lectures “should be inspirational and cultural in the broader sense, rather than that they should bear on the comparatively narrow field of pedagogy”.¹⁶⁸ After the general division session, teachers split into several different sections. The format of these breakout sessions changed several times during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. For the most part, teachers split into two sections according to grade-level. Teachers of early grades joined the Primary Section, which was led by the Superintendent. Other teachers worked in the Grammar Section, headed by the high school principal.¹⁶⁹

Houston’s local institutes concentrated upon the use of fundamental educational principles.¹⁷⁰ Horn believed that teachers who studied theory would gain “the ability to apply a general principle to a particular thing”.¹⁷¹ Indeed, Houston superintendents throughout the period believed that knowledge gained by teachers through reasoning would spawn new thought and that such thinking would be superior to the type of static knowledge that was gained through “clippings pasted in scrapbooks”.¹⁷² The Houston institutes did not provide “local” for the solution of

¹⁶⁸ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 30.

¹⁶⁹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 30.

¹⁷⁰ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1898-1899, 57.

¹⁷¹ P.W. Horn, “Educational Principles,” 2.

¹⁷² Ibid, 2; W.W. Barnett, “The Method of the Institute,” *The Texas School Journal*, 20.4 (Oct 1902): 137.

particular school's problems; rather, they were intended to be "systemic", thereby providing teachers the inspiration to resolve issues in a multitude of different and variable cases.¹⁷³

In order to help instructors gain the skills to apply educational theory to teaching, Houston institutes stressed the sustained study and discussion of educational texts and periodicals, for example, Edward L. Thorndike's *Principles of Teaching* and Herbert Spencer's *Education: Intellectual, Moral and Physical*.¹⁷⁴ Some superintendents assigned several books during the course of a scholastic year. During the 1895-1896 school year, for example, Superintendent William Seneca Sutton arranged the institute around a "History of Education" theme. He distributed a list of more than ten books with which he asked teachers to become familiar and to reference during the year's Saturday institutes.¹⁷⁵ Other superintendents, like William W. Barnett (1900-1904), based institute study for one year around a single book.¹⁷⁶ All teachers read the selected book and then undertook a slow, systematic study of the work throughout the year. Barnett believed that "it is better to narrow the discussion and deepen it, rather than to have a shallow discussion of a broad topic¹⁷⁷." The teachers themselves, however, did not always appreciate such dense study. In fact, some of the teachers found the work overly demanding and quite

¹⁷³ Houston Independent School District, *Report* 1906-1907, 27.

¹⁷⁴ Houston teachers studied Thorndike and Spencer regularly for many years. For example, see Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1896-1897, 33-36 for discussion about Spencer.

¹⁷⁵ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1895-1896, 33.

¹⁷⁶ Specifically, Houston teachers studied William James' *Psychology* and Arnold Tompkins' *The Philosophy of Teaching*. Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1900-1901, 1901-1902, 1902-1903, 1903-1904.

¹⁷⁷ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1901-1902, 37.

difficult. They disliked, in particular, William James' *Psychology*.¹⁷⁸

Houston teachers also studied the educational theories of philosophers. In 1896-1897, for example, institutes focused attention on the educational ideas of the Jesuits, Michel de Montaigne, John Locke, Herbert Spencer, Joseph Jacotot, Thomas Arnold and Robert Hebert Quick.¹⁷⁹ In their preparation for each institute, teachers were expected to answer a series of study questions and to submit them to the superintendent prior to the scheduled institute. Some of the questions asked about Spencer's essays, for example, included: "What are the three phases through which human opinion passes in seeking for the truth on given subjects"?¹⁸⁰ and "In moral education Spencer believes much in the theory of 'natural consequences.' Have you successfully applied this theory in your own work in the Houston schools? If so, give examples".¹⁸¹ Superintendent Paul W. Horn referred to this type of study as the investigation of "fundamental educational principles" which he considered the best course of study for an institute.¹⁸²

The teacher who is really worth while will never say to the superintendent, the principal or the school board: 'Tell me exactly what I must do under given circumstances.' This request is made only by the weakling. The strong teacher, on the other hand, says, 'Tell me just what the conditions are, and then let me decide for myself what is the best thing to do'.¹⁸³

¹⁷⁸ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1900-1901, 39.

¹⁷⁹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1896-1897.

¹⁸⁰ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 303.

¹⁸¹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1896-1897, 34.

¹⁸² Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1906-1907, 273.

¹⁸³ P.W. Horn, "Educational Principles", *Texas School Journal* 24.1 (1906), 6.

Horn preferred an alternative format for the study of these fundamental educational principals. Rather than requiring that all teachers study the same texts, he allowed to teachers to choose study circles based on interest.

STUDY CIRCLES WITHIN THE INSTITUTE

In 1909, Superintendent Horne restructured the city institute into a system of study circles. He divided teachers into groups in which they studied educational texts in a small-group format. Teachers could choose the study circle which she or he would attend each month although, during the course of a year, they were required to participate in at least one circle that dealt with the following subjects: 1) school management (e.g. William S. Sutton's *School Room Essentials*), 2) psychology (e.g. William James' *Psychology* or Stephen Colvin's *Human Behavior: A First Book in Psychology For Teachers*), history of education (e.g. F. V. N. Painter's *History of Education*), and educational principles (e.g. Herbert Spencer's *Educational Essays*).¹⁸⁴ Horne believed that these study circle books represented a "wide range of subjects" appropriate to practicing teachers.¹⁸⁵ As the years progressed, he shifted institute focus towards specific, technical texts that treated topics like penmanship, architecture, music, hygiene, playground safety and discipline. Most of the selected texts were current, published only a year or two before they appeared as a study circle book. Also, Horne included several texts written by women in the study circles (e.g. Lida Earhart's *Types of Teaching* and Ira Howerth's *Art of Education*).¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1915-1916, 342.

¹⁸⁵ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1916-1917, 21.

¹⁸⁶ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1915-1916, 21

At institute sessions during these years under Horne, teachers studied their chosen book for fifty minutes under the direction of a discussion leader chosen by the superintendent.¹⁸⁷ This new arrangement was popular with teachers. Also, it helped balance institute texts in such a way that pleased both novice and experienced teachers. Horne noted, for example, “The study circle plan made it possible to reach the needs of these various classes”.¹⁸⁸ He also permitted teachers who were taking correspondence classes from the University of Texas or another institution of higher learning to organize study circles around their course material.¹⁸⁹

THE INSTITUTE CIRCULAR

Houston teachers invested a considerable amount of time in the completion of supplementary work in preparation for each institute event. Sutton first introduced study question “circulars” to the institute program during the 1893-1894 school year.¹⁹⁰ These circulars, sent to teachers before each monthly institute session, contained a series of questions based on the texts and periodicals under study at the institute. At first, during the late-nineteenth century, superintendents “respectfully invited” teachers to review the circulars for discussion. Later, under superintendent Horne, completing the circulars’ questions became required.¹⁹¹ By the first decade of the twentieth-century, the completion of pre-institute work began to resemble an official examination. Teachers answered circular questions on official test paper acquired

¹⁸⁷ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1911-1912, 21

¹⁸⁸ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1909-1910, 25.

¹⁸⁹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1909-1910, 350.

¹⁹⁰ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1893-1894, 34.

¹⁹¹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 303.

from their principals as well as signed and dated their completed answer booklet. Individual school principals collected teachers' papers and submitted them to the city superintendent in advance of the institute.¹⁹² Furthermore, some superintendents required teachers to recite their answers during the institute meeting. Superintendent William Barnett explained that "the method of the recitation as followed in the universities will be pursued in the institute".¹⁹³

Generally, circular questions addressed specific topics relating to the texts and periodicals under study during a particular institute year. Some questions were specific to the point of targeting particular quotations, page numbers or chapters. For example, one question that related to Edward L. Thorndike's *Principles of Teaching* asked participants "in Exercise 7, page 130, of *Principles of Teaching*, which of the pairs should be correlated?".¹⁹⁴ Other questions were interpretive and required teachers to evaluate educational theory. For example, teachers studying Montaigne completed a question that required them to "Distinguish between knowledge and wisdom. Give your estimate of the aphorism, 'knowledge is power'".¹⁹⁵ On occasion, questions were not connected to specific institute texts. For example, Houston teachers were asked to read the following story printed in a circular distributed to teachers prior to a monthly institute meeting:

A bishop thus reproved a crowd of men who had rudely entered the room where he was to preach: 'Praying would be useless for those who enter a place of worship in that way: if you enter here properly, I shall go on, and not otherwise'.

¹⁹² Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 276.

¹⁹³ William W. Barnett, "The Method of the Institute", *Texas School Journal*, 20.4 (1902): 137.

¹⁹⁴ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1906-1907, 276.

¹⁹⁵ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1896-1897, 30.

Subsequently, teachers were required to “make practical application of the general truth of which the good bishop’s reproof is a particular example”.¹⁹⁶

In addition to the distribution of the circulars to individual teachers, Houston superintendents also sent copies to the *Texas School Journal* (1880-1930), the leading educational periodical of the era in the state. This journal frequently published the circulars in their entirety.¹⁹⁷ Through the issuance of preparatory work, superintendents believed that institutes became more “definite in purpose, impressive, fixed”.¹⁹⁸

“COLORED INSTITUTES” IN HOUSTON

African-American teachers in the city of Houston attended separate teachers’ institutes, referred to as “colored institutes”. Teachers also were segregated during joint institutes held in conjunction with Galveston teachers.¹⁹⁹ Although the State Superintendent of Public Instruction requested that the white and colored sections be held on different days of the week²⁰⁰, occasionally they were held on the same date but at different times and/or in different places, as was the practice in both San Antonio and Houston. This format enabled the same guest speakers and lectures to visit both the white and the colored institutes in succession.²⁰¹ In general, the

¹⁹⁶ Ibid 40.

¹⁹⁷ See, for example, William Barnett, “Houston Institute for October”, *Texas School Journal*, 19.4 (1901): 118; Paul W. Horne, “Institute Circular”, *Texas School Journal*, 24.3 (1906): 7.

¹⁹⁸ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1898-1899, 56.

¹⁹⁹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1892-1893, 18.

²⁰⁰ J.M. Carlisle, “County Institutes,” *The Texas School Journal*, 11.11 (Nov 1898):363.

²⁰¹ Houston Independent School District, *Report of the Superintendent of Houston Public Schools*. (Houston: Gray, Dillaye and Co, 1907-1908), 304.

colored institutes had the same format as the white institutes and were also presided over by the city or county superintendent.²⁰² Generally, African-American teachers were given the latitude to tailor institute content to the needs of their schools, which sometimes included topics addressing civil rights. This did not go unnoticed by white administrators, who often disapproved of the freedom given to Houston's African-American institute conductors. Falls County Superintendent A.W. Eddins complained, for example, that "our Negro institutes should be looked after more closely, and be made to do such work as will be of actual benefit when the Negro teachers return to their schools".²⁰³

In Houston, at least, institutes were not regulated in the manner stipulated by Superintendent Eddins. Houston institutes for African-American teachers were particularly likely to embrace issues important to the black community. In a 1908 evening meeting of Houston's colored city institute, for example, community members agreed to support and to raise funds for the establishment of manual training in the city colored schools.²⁰⁴ At this institute, Principal Edward L. Blackshear of the State Normal and Industrial College of Prairie View, the colored normal school in Texas, presented a special address entitled "Should our Schools be Industrialized?". Blackshear, in sympathy with George Washington Carver's ideas, advocated the inclusion of manual training classes within Houston's black schools.

²⁰² See, for example, Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 66; C. Hartman, "The Travis County School Annual: A Circular of Information" (Austin, Texas: Von Boeckmann-Jones Company Printers, 1905): 9. For greater details about the similarities and differences between white and colored institutes in Houston, see Mindy Spearman, "In-Service Education of Houston Teachers, 1887-1916."

²⁰³ A.W. Eddins, "The Aims and Purposes of the Institute", *Texas School Journal*, 25.2 (1907), 30.

²⁰⁴ Reprinted in Houston Independent School District, *Report* 1907-1908, 33.

This particular lecture was reportedly “listened to by a throng of colored citizens”.²⁰⁵ At the conclusion of the address, citizens made \$100 contributions to fund an industrial training program at the colored high school. Still, the inclusion of community topics in institutes—both colored and white—was a subject of contention.²⁰⁶ H.T Musselman, in a special series of articles on county institutes published in *The Texas School Journal*, wrote: “If you count the time of the institute in dollars and cents, I have seen a hundred thousand dollars wasted in our Texas institutes the last five years by political and other types of the ‘dropper-in’ at our county institutes”.²⁰⁷

One serious discrepancy in colored teacher institutes began in 1909, when Superintendent Horne restructured part of the Saturday institutes into a group of study circles. Colored teachers were not given an option to choose their own study circles, but instead were assigned one text for the entire group. Superintendent Horne justified this decision by saying that the colored teachers were smaller in number and multiple study groups were thus impossible.²⁰⁸

Colored institutes in the city had a high profile, thanks to the involvement of Houston African-American teachers in the publication of the *Texas School Journal*. A notable feature in the *Texas School Journal* was the Department for Colored Teachers, “devoted specially to the interests of the colored children, colored schools

²⁰⁵ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1907-1908, 33.

²⁰⁶ A. W. Eddins, “The Aims and Purposes of the Institute,” *The Texas School Journal* 25.2 (Oct 1907): 30.

²⁰⁷ H.T. Musselman, “What of the County Institute in Texas,” *The Texas School Journal* 34.4 (Nov 1916): 28.

²⁰⁸ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1909-1910, 351.

and colored teachers of Texas”.²⁰⁹ The section appeared in the *Texas School Journal* in 1895 and continued to be published in that magazine, fairly regularly, for the next six years. It included professional development programs from official organizations for black teachers across state; certainly, the State Normal and Industrial College of Prairie View,²¹⁰ colored teacher institutes,²¹¹ the North Texas Colored Teachers Association²¹², the Central Texas Colored Teachers Association²¹³ and the Texas State Colored Teachers’ Association.²¹⁴ The section also had a “Department Notes” feature with editorials on topics affecting colored teachers. African-American teachers in Houston contributed to this section of the journal on a regular basis, even endorsing the Department for Colored Teachers with a special unanimous resolution.²¹⁵

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE HOUSTON CITY INSTITUTES

Institutes for Houston teachers maintained a high profile across the state of Texas. These programs became a model for institute work. Journal editors called the Houston institutes “unusually strong”, believing that “the report of the Houston

²⁰⁹ “To the Colored Teachers of Texas”, *Texas School Journal* 13.11 (1895): 466.

²¹⁰ “Biennial Report of the Principal of Prairie View Normal College”, *Texas School Journal* 18.9 (1901): 323.

²¹¹ “Colored Teachers Institute of Waller County”, *Texas School Journal*, 8.5 (1890): 121.

²¹² “Program of the North Texas Colored Teachers’ Association”, *Texas School Journal* 9.6 (1901): 198-200.

²¹³ “Programme of the Central Texas Colored Teachers Association”, *Texas School Journal*, 14.4 (1896).

²¹⁴ See, for example, “The Colored Teachers’ Association”, *Texas School Journal*, 4.8 (1886): 274; “Colored State Teachers’ Association”, *Texas School Journal*, 5.6 (1887): 179; “Program of Colored Teachers Association of Texas”, *Texas School Journal*, 23.4 (1905).

²¹⁵ “The Houston Teachers Meeting”, *Texas School Journal*, 17.4 (1889): 564.

schools shows the best course in supplementary reading”.²¹⁶ Certainly, the unusually intensive content of the institutes had something to do with their visibility, and perhaps, notoriety.²¹⁷ However, the its strong reputation likely had much to do with the close associations that Houston city superintendents had with the state educational periodical, the *Texas School Journal*. William Seneca Sutton, who served as Houston superintendent from 1887 to 1897, published frequent articles in the journal, both during and subsequent to his tenure as superintendent. Paul W. Horne, city superintendent from 1904 to 1921, actually took a position as associate editor of the journal in 1907.²¹⁸ The journal often discussed the “special work” of the Houston city institutes, and urged other superintendents to follow that model.²¹⁹ Part of the Houston story of teacher institutes, then, represents the role that personal connections of individual superintendents could play in garnering acclaim for the work of the teacher’s institute.

The Houston school system was also notable for its concentration on strategic knowledge; that is, the empowerment of teachers to apply theoretical principles to cases in practice.²²⁰ Although the readings were dense and teachers sometimes complained, Houston teacher institutes represented a successful effort by which to encourage teachers to take active roles in making sound professional judgments. Throughout this era, teachers maintained positive comments about the work:

²¹⁶ “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal*, 14.3 (1896): 100.

²¹⁷ “Editorial”, *The Texas School Journal* 14.3 (Mar 1896): 100.

²¹⁸ “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal*, 25.1 (1907): 20.

²¹⁹ “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal*, 24.1 (1906): 19.

²²⁰ For a discussion of strategic knowledge, see Lee Shulman, “Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching,” *Educational Researcher*, 5.2 (1986):4.

I think that it is very helpful to young teachers, as it trains them to thoughtful observation of the phenomena of their own minds and those of others, and is an aid to them in learning the teacher's greatest lesson—the art of adapting the instruction he has to give to the mind which is to receive it.²²¹

For many Houston teachers, then, the study of fundamental educational principles was a worthy focus for institute work. Still, not all cities in Texas took the same focus with their local teachers' institutes. In San Antonio, for example, a unique type of teachers' institute emerged at the start of the twentieth century. Named the School of Methods, this type of teachers' institute shunned educational principles and, instead, focused almost entirely upon pedagogy.

²²¹ Anonymous quotation from a participant in the 1891-1892 Houston teacher institute, which focused on educational principles. Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1891-1892, 26.

CHAPTER 3:

THE SCHOOL OF METHODS IN

SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS

The educational situation in San Antonio during the Reconstruction era mirrored the state of Texas as a whole. In 1870, the city's public schools have been described as "haphazard and unsettled". When the city's school for African-American children opened, for example, some 170 students enrolled and only one instructor hired to teach these children.²²² Furthermore, the schools were ungraded, with no principals to oversee students and curriculum.²²³ City school enrollment doubled in the 1880's because of the city's population explosion. This population explosion necessitated immediate improvement of the educational system. Like the situation in Houston, the educational outlook in San Antonio gradually improved during the last few decades of the nineteenth-century. Much of this progress can be attributed to the superintendency of William Cornelius Rote (1878-1885), who helped improve the school system through creative staffing, an aggressive building plan and improved organizational structures. By the end of Rote's tenure as superintendent, 61 teachers taught 3,464 students in 11 different San Antonio schools. Charles Hanus, in his excellent historical study of curriculum in the San

²²² Charles Hanus, "That All May Learn: A History of Curriculum in San Antonio Public Schools to 1925", (PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1997), 39-40.

²²³ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 50.

Antonio public schools, asserts that Rote, “more than anyone else in the nineteenth-century, shaped the curriculum and organization of public education in San Antonio”.²²⁴

By 1900, San Antonio was the largest city in the State of Texas, with a population of 53,321.²²⁵ Compared to growth patterns in other American urban areas during the same time period, San Antonio possessed a significant number of modernizing conveniences, like “civic government, utilities, street paving and maintenance, water supply, telephones, hospitals, and a power plant”.²²⁶ In 1905, 400 teachers taught 14,000 students in 26 different schools.²²⁷ A *Texas School Journal* article published that same year called the city “distinctly cosmopolitan, therefore unconventional and openhearted . . . San Antonio has not the sameness about it you find in many places”.²²⁸ Lloyd E. Wolfe (1902-1908), who was San Antonio superintendent during that year, inaugurated a series of educational improvements in manual training, child-centered curriculum and teacher training that kept “forging [the public schools] ahead”.²²⁹

By 1915, the year that John Franklin Bobbit conducted a survey of the San Antonio school system, the scholastic population was 21, 983. According to the survey, the racial background of the scholastic population was approximately 52%

²²⁴ Hanus, “That All May Learn”, 66.

²²⁵ T. Fehrenbach, “San Antonio: Texas”, *The Handbook of Texas Online*.
<<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/SS/hds2.html>> (date accessed 10 November 2004).

²²⁶ Fehrenbach, “San Antonio: Texas”.

²²⁷ W. F. Knox, “Ho! For San Antonio!”, *Texas School Magazine* 9.8 (1905), 10.

²²⁸ W. F. Knox, “Ho! For San Antonio!”.

²²⁹ W. F. Knox, “Ho! For San Antonio!”.

“Americans and Europeans”, 39% “Mexican” and 9% “Negro”.²³⁰ Policymakers routinely used the term “Mexican” to describe Latino students during the early-twentieth century, despite the fact that most scholastic-age children of the time were not born in Mexico.²³¹ Indeed, in 1934, Herschel Manuel called Bexar County one of the “centers of Mexican population” in the state of Texas.²³² San Antonio had several private schools with high enrolments of Mexican students. These schools, which offered bilingual instruction in Spanish and English, attracted the Mexican upper class.²³³ Other Spanish-speaking children attended San Antonio public schools. Although Mexican children were not relegated to separate schools, they were unofficially segregated due to place of residence. Schools that had a high population of Mexican children became known as “Mexican Schools”. Like the city of Houston, teachers’ institutes in San Antonio made no special provisions for teachers in “Mexican Schools”; presumably, these teachers attended the city’s white teachers’ institutes. Compared to the Houston schools, the San Antonio system employed relatively few African-American teachers during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Like Houston, the African-American teachers who did work for the city, at least initially, received the same salary as their Anglo counterparts.²³⁴

²³⁰ Bobbitt, *San Antonio Public School System*, 7.

²³¹ Matthew Davis, “No Simple Americanizers: Three Early Anglo Researchers of Mexican-American Education”, *The Educational Forum* (Winter 2001).

²³² Herschel Thurman Manuel, “The Mexican Population in Texas,” *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly*, 15.1 (1934), 23.

²³³ Carlos Kevin Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981* (College Station, TX: Texas A&M University Press, 2004), 25-26.

²³⁴ Hanus, “That All May Learn”, 90.

Due much to San Antonio's continuously swelling scholastic population, the city earned the title of "the leading educational center of Texas".²³⁵ Indeed, San Antonio superintendents developed particularly expansive in-service programs during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Certainly, its efforts were as noteworthy as were those of the Houston schools, and, probably, more expansive than any other school system in the state save Houston.

TYPES OF INSTITUTES IN SAN ANTONIO

San Antonio teachers, like their counterparts in the city of Houston, had the opportunity to attend the state's system of summer normal institutes. Unlike Houston, however, the summer normal for San Antonio teachers was held within the city limits.²³⁶ San Antonio teachers who attended the optional summer normal institutes paid a \$5.00 tuition fee. However, perhaps because San Antonio teachers could attend without paying extra for travel, room and board, the San Antonio summer institutes had a high enrollment.²³⁷

Practicing teachers in San Antonio attended Bexar County institutes, which met for three two-day sessions during the school year. These institutes tended to follow the course of county institute study suggested by the Texas State Superintendent of Instruction.²³⁸ These lectures, which concentrated on specialized

²³⁵ W. F. Knox, "Ho! For San Antonio!".

²³⁶ See, for example, "Second Series of Summer Normals," *Texas School Journal*, 20.1 (1902), 11.

²³⁷ Cecilia Elizabeth Schiffers, "Education in the San Antonio Express: 1890-1939" (M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1940), 68-69.

²³⁸ P.F. Stewart, *Bexar County School Annual 1914-1915* (San Antonio: Nic Tengg Booksheller Stationer and Printing, 1915).

topics, were heard by the general corps of teachers. Many Bexar County institute sessions also included topics which focused on rural issues; for example, a lecture on “The Manner of Grading Cotton”, “Needed Legislation for the County Schools” and “Civics in Our Rural Schools”.²³⁹ The county institutes were mandatory for all San Antonio teachers, even though an attorney ruled in 1906 that “since the city schools have their own institutes and methods of improvement and instruction”, city teachers should not be forced to attend county institutes.²⁴⁰ Indeed, by the second decade of the twentieth century, Bexar County institutes were the biggest county meetings in the State of Texas, with more than 1,500 teachers in attendance.²⁴¹

Mandatory San Antonio city institutes began in 1878 with Superintendent William C. Rote, who held the meetings almost every Saturday. They continued throughout the nineteenth century, albeit irregularly, occasionally stopping when the city underwent a period of frequent superintendent turnover from 1897 to 1902. When Lloyd E. Wolfe took over as superintendent of the San Antonio system in 1902, he changed the format of the city institutes to target practical classroom issues.

²³⁹ “Teachers Open Institute: Bexar County Pedagogues Hear Lectures From Numerous Experts on Rural Education Problems”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, September 7, 1915; “Plans for Grading the Schools: Teachers in County Institute Take Steps Looking to Consolidation of Districts”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, October 11, 1906; “Bexar County Teachers’ Institute”, *Texas School Journal* 17.2 (1899), 482.

²⁴⁰ *San Antonio Daily Express*, September 28, 1906

²⁴¹ Charles S. Meek, “The Biggest County Institute Ever Held in Texas”, *Texas School Journal* 35.1 (1917), 17.

For several years the conviction has been growing upon me that both in normal schools and in city institutes and extension classes relatively too great emphasis is placed upon psychology, history of education, management, philosophy of education, and the higher branches of study, and too little emphasis upon a broad, scholarly, and critical study of the common school course of study.²⁴²

He was conscious of the time-constraints placed upon city institutes and believed that study of such “higher branches” wasted too much time.²⁴³ He also disliked institutes that required teachers to answer written questions about institute work and called such examinations “little less than a crime”.²⁴⁴ Instead, Wolfe centred the San Antonio institutes on class drills and daily classroom work.²⁴⁵ In these ways, San Antonio city institutes were quite different from those held in the city of Houston.

One other mode of teachers’ institute existed in the city during the early twentieth century—this one innovative and unique to San Antonio. Lloyd E. Wolfe, San Antonio superintendent from 1902 until 1908, created a special in-service program—in addition to the regular city and county institutes—which he called the “School of Methods”. This mandatory school operated in the summer and was free of charge to city teachers. Teachers from outside the city were also invited, but they paid a \$5.00 tuition fee. The idea behind the San Antonio School of Methods was to give “sound pedagogical suggestions”²⁴⁶. The school focused on methods for a wide variety of subjects, including physical education, storytelling and geography.

²⁴² San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), *Annual Report of the San Antonio School Board* (San Antonio: Press of Clarke Printing Company, 1907), 18.

²⁴³ San Antonio Independent School District, *1907 Annual Report*, 18.

²⁴⁴ “San Antonio School of Methods”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 7, 1903.

²⁴⁵ San Antonio Independent School District, *1905 Annual Report*, 60.

²⁴⁶ “School of Methods”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 9, 1904.

Specific information concerning institutes for African-American teachers in the city of San Antonio is scarce. At the very least, fragmentary evidence admits that principals and teachers at the colored schools had regularly scheduled city institutes with the superintendent at Douglas High School, the segregated high school in San Antonio.²⁴⁷ Likewise, Superintendent Lloyd Wolfe held a separate School of Methods for “local and non-resident colored teachers”.²⁴⁸ This school was held on the same day as the School of Methods for white teachers, but in a different location—again, at the Douglas School. This format enabled guest speakers to lecture and visit both the white and the colored school in succession.²⁴⁹ Presumably, these institutes followed the same format and content as the city’s white teachers’ institutes.

LLOYD E. WOLFE: THE MAN AND HIS IDEOLOGY

The San Antonio School of Methods is intimately linked with Lloyd E. Wolfe, a superintendent who placed a particularly high value upon the continuing professional development of teachers. He considered this emphasis one of the “three fundamentals” (along with strong hiring practices and a rich course of study) of a successful school system.²⁵⁰ Wolfe conceptualized and created the School of Methods himself, and this type of institute was essentially in existence only during his tenure as superintendent. Thus, understanding the personal background and

²⁴⁷ See, for example, “Teacher’s Meetings Announced”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, September 4, 1915.

²⁴⁸ “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal* 21.10 (1904): 1024-1025.

²⁴⁹ “School of Methods,” *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 20, 1905

²⁵⁰ San Antonio Independent School District, *1905 Annual Report*, 59-60.

ideologies of this individual city superintendent is essential to a robust understanding of the School of Methods.

When Lloyd E. Wolfe became San Antonio's Superintendent of schools on June 21, 1902, he arrived with a personal recommendation from William Torrey Harris, the United States Commissioner of Education.²⁵¹ Several recommenders described Wolfe as "one of the best superintendents in the United States", lauding his willingness to investigate current educational problems.²⁵² Heavily influenced by Francis W. Parker, Wolfe emphasized methodology that stressed child-centred activities and real-world problem solving.²⁵³ His ideas about teaching also drew heavily from the writings of James M. Greenwood and Charles A. McMurry, as well as from other members of the National Herbart Society.²⁵⁴ Wolfe also strongly advocated vocational education, because he believed that American schools needed to adapt to an increasingly industrialized population. He actively participated in professional organizations and was well-connected to national education movements. For example, Wolfe was a member of the National Educational Association's Committee of Twelve on Rural Schools. He also helped charter the National Society for the Scientific Study of Education, a group which developed from the National Herbart Society.²⁵⁵ Such ideas and activities mark Wolfe as the first progressive San Antonio superintendent.²⁵⁶

²⁵¹ "New School Superintendent", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 13, 1902.

²⁵² "New School Superintendent", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 13, 1902.

²⁵³ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 154.

²⁵⁴ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 156.

²⁵⁵ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 151.

²⁵⁶ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 252.

Wolfe's progressive ideology garnered an endorsement from the Texas' major education periodical, *The Texas School Journal*.²⁵⁷ This journal was a long-standing supporter of educational innovation. For example, a late 19th century editorial opined "The progressive teachers are securing the best positions. Old fogies may oppose the new education and try to make teachers slide along in old ruts, but their power is waning".²⁵⁸ Wolfe contributed at least one article to *The Texas School Journal* during his superintendency.²⁵⁹ In return, the journal heavily promoted Wolfe's professional development programs like the School of Methods.²⁶⁰

Wolfe also received strong support from George W. Brackenridge, president of the San Antonio School Board. Brackenridge supported manual training, Negro education, women's rights, and other progressive causes.²⁶¹ He also strongly believed that education should be free of political influence.²⁶² When Wolfe arrived in San Antonio in 1902, he had no link to contemporary San Antonio politics. With his apolitical stance and progressive outlook, Wolfe quickly won Brackenridge's staunch support. According to Wolfe, "trained teachers are even more important to a school system than an ideal course of study".²⁶³ After his initial observation of the

²⁵⁷ "Editorial", *Texas School Journal* 21.10 (1904): 1022.

²⁵⁸ "Editorial", *Texas School Journal* 3.1 (1885): 32.

²⁵⁹ For example, see Lloyd Wolfe, "Teaching for Power", *Texas School Journal* 20.7 (1903): 355-356.

²⁶⁰ For example, see "News and notes", *Texas School Journal* 21.10 (1904): 1024-1025.

²⁶¹ Marilyn McAdams Sibley, *George W. Brackenridge: Maverick Philanthropist* (Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1973), 195.

²⁶² Sibley, *George W. Brackenridge*, 165.

²⁶³ San Antonio Independent School District (SAISD), *Annual Report of the San Antonio School Board* (San Antonio: Press of Clarke Printing Company, 1903).

city's public schools, he was unimpressed with the district's quality of teaching and took an innovative step to solve the problem—the creation of the San Antonio School of Methods.

FINANCING THE INSTITUTE

Financing the annual School of Methods was an expensive process; in particular, Wolfe needed funds to pay prominent national educators for their attendance at the institute. Initially, the school board appropriated money to finance the School of Methods. It designated \$800 for each of the first three years.²⁶⁴ Some financial support came through out-of-district teachers who each paid \$5.00 for attendance.²⁶⁵ The income earned through tuition costs significantly helped defray costs; in 1904, out-of-district teachers paid \$375 in tuition.²⁶⁶ The school also received community donations; for example, \$300 from the Business Men's Club in 1903.²⁶⁷ Community organizations donated services to the school, as well. The Women's Club of San Antonio donated afternoon sewing lessons to all teachers. The women also offered free use of their cooking facilities, in order that visiting teachers could defray boarding costs.²⁶⁸

²⁶⁴ San Antonio Independent School District, *1905 Annual Report*, 58; San Antonio Independent School District, *1904 Annual Report*., 42.

²⁶⁵ San Antonio Independent School District, *1904 Annual Report*., 42.

²⁶⁶ San Antonio Independent School District, *1904 Annual Report*., 42.

²⁶⁷ San Antonio Independent School District, *1903 Annual Report*., 58

²⁶⁸ *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 1 1903.

THE SCHOOL OF METHODS: A UNIQUE WOLFE DEVELOPMENT

Wolfe's strong progressive ideology necessitated a flexible outlet, and neither the city nor the county institute was an acceptable fit. He really wanted an autonomous program, one that was free from the official state department prescriptions of the county institute and the temporal constraints of the city institute. Thus, in 1903, he created a month-long summer School of Methods. The school was entirely Wolfe's own conception and was unique to San Antonio. He poured considerable time and effort into the program. He structured its format, chose its content, secured guest speakers, raised the necessary funds, and advertised for the school by himself. He considered the program a beacon of educational innovation: "this School of Methods will mark an epoch in educational progress".²⁶⁹

The origin of the name "School of Methods" harkened back to the nineteenth-century. In 1894, Texas' State Superintendent of Public Instruction organized two "Schools of Methods", one in Galveston and one in Fort Worth.²⁷⁰ Their office heavily promoted the schools state-wide, advertising them as "advanced" institutes that would cover practical work "of the highest order".²⁷¹ They differed from summer normals in that the work was largely professional rather than academic. Although the two schools were short-lived, they were popular enough such that the name "School of Methods" became synonymous with high-quality teacher education with a professional focus. This focus was precisely the one that Wolfe desired to convey.

²⁶⁹ "San Antonio School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 7, 1903.

²⁷⁰ "Professional Institutes", *Texas School Journal* 12.5 (1894):169-170.

²⁷¹ "Professional Institutes", 169-170.

Wolfe organized San Antonio's School of Methods into several different sections. Each morning, he addressed the general assembly of attendees. Afterward, teachers listened to additional lectures and watched pedagogic demonstrations, after which they broke out into grade-level groups. In these groups, teachers participated in roundtable sessions. Wolfe sometimes led the roundtables, while visiting scholars moderated other sessions. The afternoon session varied in format. Some days were devoted to class drills that took place in a mock school with a model class of pupils for each grade and the high school.²⁷² Local principals were in charge of each classroom and participating teachers practised methods of teaching various subjects.²⁷³ On other afternoons, teachers took field trips to sites around the city. During the 1906 School of Methods, for example, teachers went on a botanical excursion to Brackenridge Park, to a vegetable garden in order to study agriculture, and to local lumber mills as part of an industrial arts study.²⁷⁴

Most fieldtrips emphasized manual training and industrial arts, a major content focus of the School of Methods. The school also covered drawing, sewing, botany, gardening, agriculture, woodworking, industrial geography, and business.²⁷⁵ Methodology was another focus; e.g. "The Use of Methods in Teaching the Child"²⁷⁶ and "Critical Child Study".²⁷⁷ The content was presented through hands-on activities

²⁷² San Antonio Independent School District, *1905 Annual Report*.

²⁷³ "School of Methods: Advanced Educational Work is Being Exemplified", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 4, 1904.

²⁷⁴ "Bigger Attendance at the School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 30, 1906; "School of Methods: Attendance and Interest of Teachers is Growing Each Day", *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 31, 1906.

²⁷⁵ "Bigger Attendance at the School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 30, 1906

²⁷⁶ "The Use of Methods in Teaching the Child", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 25, 1903.

²⁷⁷ "Teacher Must Know a Child to Teach", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 7, 1905.

and demonstrations. For example, in 1905, teachers participated in a daily exercise class to learn about physical activity and children's movement.²⁷⁸ Wolfe also brought to San Antonio nationally prominent guest speakers to lecture to the teachers; "The purpose of the School of Methods is to bring our teachers in contact with some of the ablest educational lectures and most skilful teachers of the country".²⁷⁹ The lectures were interactive and designed to keep "the audience on alert".²⁸⁰ Several of the visiting scholars also conducted evening sessions open to all members of the San Antonio community.²⁸¹

During the school's inaugural year, Wolfe secured W.O. Krohn of Illinois State Normal University as one of the school's guest speakers. Krohn lectured each day for three weeks, mainly on physical education.²⁸² In 1904, Richard Wyche of North Carolina spoke on storytelling and geography methods for the primary grades. Wyche was particularly well-received by the teachers.²⁸³ Alexander Caswell Ellis from The University of Texas lectured at the 1905 school, selecting such topics as "Strength and Value in Teaching" and "Stubbornness in Children".²⁸⁴ Not all of the visiting scholars were men. Georgia Alexander, supervisor of language and composition of the Indianapolis Public Schools, instructed at the 1905 School of

²⁷⁸ "School of Methods Will Be Popular", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 6, 1905.

²⁷⁹ San Antonio Independent School District, *1905 Annual Report*, 60.

²⁸⁰ "School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 9, 1904.

²⁸¹ "The Use of Methods in Teaching the Child", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 25, 1903.

²⁸² Hanus, "That All May Learn", 197.

²⁸³ "Wyche Ends Engagement With School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 7, 1904.

²⁸⁴ "School of Methods: Good Attendance Continues in Teachers' Summer School", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 16, 1905; "Literature in Schools: Dr. McMurry Shows the Cultural Value of the Study of Literature", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 21, 1905.

Methods. Alexander covered several different aspects of primary methods, including language, industrial training and composition.²⁸⁵

Charles A. McMurry of the Northern Illinois State Normal School was probably the most distinguished of all the School of Methods' lecturers. McMurry possessed a special interest in teacher education, and enjoyed working with young teachers.²⁸⁶ Like Superintendent Wolfe, McMurry was an enthusiastic and knowledgeable Herbartian who placed high value on pedagogy of a particular kind. The two men were great friends. Wolfe stressed McMurry's ability to offer jargon-free practical advice: [he is] "peculiarly gifted in ability to make fundamental educational principles plain through clear, simple statements, and through well chosen examples".²⁸⁷ In return, McMurry complimented Wolfe's steadfast ideology, giving "glowing tribute to the worth of Superintendent Wolfe as an educator".²⁸⁸ McMurry lectured at the San Antonio School of Methods for two years, 1904 and 1905. Local San Antonio newspapers devoted a great deal of column space to McMurry's visits. The *San Antonio Daily Express* gave McMurry increased coverage in the Sunday newspapers, believing his work to be of such high quality that it deserved "a somewhat fuller exposition of his ideas than the weekday

²⁸⁵ "Dr. McMurry Now With School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 13, 1905; "School of Methods: Good Attendance Continues in Teachers' Summer School", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 16, 1905.

²⁸⁶ Mary Louise Seguel, *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966).

²⁸⁷ "News and Notes" *Texas School Journal*, 21.10 (1904), 1025.

²⁸⁸ "To Make School of Methods Permanent: Teachers Enthusiastic Over the Summer Course", *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 24, 1905.

edition of the papers could give”.²⁸⁹ McMurry’s was heavily promoted in both major Texas Education periodicals. According to the *Texas School Journal*’s editorial board, Wolfe “knows where to find the best talent in this country. It is safe to say that no stronger man than Dr. Charles A. McMurry could have been found”.²⁹⁰ *The Texas School Magazine* endorsed McMurry’s publications as the best sources for teachers who have a high interest in methodology.²⁹¹

The School of Methods continued for five years, ending when Wolfe left office in 1908. Unlike the city and county institutes, the school of methods brought Wolfe considerable state-wide attention. The *Texas School Journal* published editorials encouraging teacher attendance.²⁹² Both the *San Antonio Daily Express* and the *San Antonio Light* published regular articles about the daily proceedings during the 1903, 1904 and 1905 sessions. However, the publicity also garnered criticism.

THE POLITICS OF CONTINUING TEACHER EDUCATION IN SAN ANTONIO

Wolfe’s entire administration aroused considerable debate throughout San Antonio. Traditional teachers disliked the attention he gave to manual training classes, school trustees disapproved of the amount of money he spent on new programs, and prominent San Antonio citizens complained about his progressive ideas. Bryan Callaghan, Jr, elected Mayor of San Antonio in 1905, emerged as

²⁸⁹ “Dr. McMurray’s Lectures: Their Far Reaching Influence on School Work”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 19, 1904.

²⁹⁰ “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal* 21.10 (1904): 1022.

²⁹¹ “Editorial”, *Texas School Magazine* 1.1 (1898): 18.

²⁹² “Editorial”, *Texas School Journal* 21.10 (1904): 1022.

Wolfe's harshest critic. With the support of School Board President Brackenridge, Wolfe staved off Callaghan and other critics for the first few years of his superintendency. However, in February, 1906, Brackenridge resigned, a move that left Wolfe open to detractors. Callaghan immediately attempted to oust Wolfe by campaigning to unseat the superintendent's supporters on the school board during the May 1906 trustee election.

Local newspapers called this election "beyond a doubt the most interesting campaign for School Trustees that has ever been held in this city".²⁹³ The election pitted three Wolfe supporters, who ran on "The School Children's Ticket" against three Callaghan supporters, who campaigned as "The People's Ticket." The bitter campaign included name calling, character attacks²⁹⁴ and accusations of fraud.²⁹⁵ Men on the School Children's Ticket claimed that their opponents harboured selfish political motives, exhibited an "evil influence",²⁹⁶ and favored "retrogression in the schools rather than progress".²⁹⁷ The *San Antonio Daily Express* strongly endorsed the ticket of Wolfe's supporters, agreeing that politics had no place in the public schools.²⁹⁸

²⁹³ "Children's Ticket is the Winner", *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 6, 1906.

²⁹⁴ "To the Voters of the Independent School District of San Antonio", *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 5, 1906.

²⁹⁵ "Election Being Hotly Contested", *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 5, 1906.

²⁹⁶ "The School Children's Ticket for School Trustees: NO POLITICS", *San Antonio Daily Express*, April 26, 1906.

²⁹⁷ "The School Children's Ticket for School Trustees: NO POLITICS", *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 3, 1906.

²⁹⁸ "The School Children's Friends", *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 1, 1906.

The People's Ticket ran on a platform that accused Wolfe and the current school board of wasting money on "fadism", "frills" and "experimentation".²⁹⁹ Seeking to highlight political controversy, Callaghan latched on to the School of Methods as emblematic of Wolfe's "new-fangled methods".³⁰⁰ In a political advertisement called "Fads The People Pay For", the People's Ticket criticized Wolfe's program with sardonic prose. They alleged that during the School of Methods, the "victims" [teachers]:

Were permitted to read the daily puffs, the vaunting of our new frills and our gaudy butterfly flounces in which we were garbed in this grand sidestep school cake-walk. Besides, was it not enough to bask in the halo of the radiance that surrounds the throne? ³⁰¹

They argued that "little frail woman teacher[s]" were not strong enough to be in the "stifling, germ-laden heat of the city" during the middle of the summer for professional development. Additionally, they criticized the amount of money Wolfe spent in order to bring "a Big Gun who looked like a Little Gun" [McMurry] to San Antonio: "Dr. Mc., it was a snug little sum you got for a few day's work". All this, the People's Ticket claimed, was done in foolish pursuit of progress: "Oh Progress, Progress! What dark deeds to lurk in thy seductive shadow!".³⁰²

The Children's Ticket claimed a narrow victory.³⁰³ Although Wolfe's supporters technically "won" the 1906 election, the campaign of smear and scandal had significant effects on professional development in San Antonio. Wolfe

²⁹⁹ "So-Called Fads and Frills", *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 5, 1906.

³⁰⁰ *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 3, 1906.

³⁰¹ "Fads the People Pay For", *San Antonio Daily Express*, April 29, 1906.

³⁰² "Fads the People Pay For", *San Antonio Daily Express*, April 29, 1906.

³⁰³ *San Antonio Daily Express*, May 6, 1906.

continued the School of Methods, yet the controversial program received little attention in 1906 and 1907. Wolfe stopped advertising the school, and, consequently, attendance of out-of-district teachers waned. The district's 1906 and 1907 annual superintendent reports barely mentioned the school and both the *San Antonio Daily Express* and the *San Antonio Daily Light* virtually discontinued their coverage of the school's proceedings. Lacking financial resources, Wolfe no longer secured prominent educators to come to San Antonio to deliver professional development lectures. Instead, he relied primarily on local San Antonio teachers.³⁰⁴ Compared to the first four years of Wolfe's superintendancy, the format of professional development work conducted after the 1906 election differed strikingly. For example, in 1905, teachers spent the morning involved in heated roundtable discussions with nationally prominent educators; in 1906, "paper folding, cutting and pasting made up the industrial art work of the morning".³⁰⁵

Two years later, Mayor Callaghan again tried to oust Wolfe with another political campaign. The People's Ticket nominated three school board candidates for the March 1908 election, and advocating the same platform with which they nearly achieved victory in 1906: "We are opposed to expensive and extravagant fads now in vogue".³⁰⁶ By then, the School of Methods was out of the spotlight, likely due to the extensive cutbacks Wolfe made to the program. Instead, Callaghan targeted some of Wolfe's other progressive reforms, manual training, school

³⁰⁴ "Children's Ticket is the Winner", San Antonio Independent School District, *1907 Annual Report*, 47.

³⁰⁵ "Bigger Attendance at the School of Methods", *San Antonio Daily Light*, May 30, 1906.

³⁰⁶ "People's Ticket Placed in Field at Mass Meeting", *San Antonio Daily Express*, March 5, 1908.

gardening and domestic science.³⁰⁷ This time, the People's Ticket was an easy winner.

Without a supportive Board of Education Wolfe resigned less than one month later, a decision that surprised many members of the San Antonio community.³⁰⁸ In his statement of withdrawal, Wolfe complained that "there has always been a minority of the members of the board, of the principals, of the teachers and patrons who have opposed these salutary reforms as bitterly as if it were some selfish end I was seeking".³⁰⁹ He left San Antonio without retracting his ideology:

If I had my work to do over again, I would adopt the same policies. I would rather have the consciousness that the sole motive that has guided me in my six years of work has been the highest of interest of the children than to have an unlimited tenure of office.³¹⁰

Wolfe's successor was Charles Lufkin (1908-1915). As a representative of Mayor Callaghan's conservative positions, Lufkin undid many of Wolfe's innovations. He closed manual training schools, reduced or eliminated foreign language programs, and completely eliminated the school gardening programs. He abolished the School of Methods, and held city institutes only infrequently such that "teacher training became such in name only".³¹¹ Although Lufkin's educational ideology strikingly was opposite to that of Wolfe, he faced a problem similar to that of his successor. In 1915, John Franklin Bobbitt, a University of Chicago professor of Education, conducted a highly critical study of the San Antonio school district.

³⁰⁷ "Campaign is Closed With a Big Meeting", *San Antonio Daily Express*, March 10, 1908.

³⁰⁸ "Wolfe Withdraws as a Candidate for Superintendent", *San Antonio Daily Light*, April 2, 1908.

³⁰⁹ "Superintendent Wolfe Defends His Policies", *San Antonio Daily Light*, April 5, 1908.

³¹⁰ Superintendent Wolfe Defends His Policies", *San Antonio Daily Light*, April 5, 1908.

³¹¹ *San Antonio Daily Light*, April 12, 1915.

He condemned San Antonio's professional development programs, noting that "the present methods of training produce mechanical rule-of-thumb teachers".³¹² Bobbitt's survey raised public awareness of critical problems in the San Antonio school district. The results of Bobbitt's survey, coupled with the superintendent's perceived lack of progressivism, forced Lufkin out of office.³¹³

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE SAN ANTONIO SCHOOL OF METHODS

The story of San Antonio's School of Methods during the superintendency of Lloyd Wolfe demonstrates how in-service education is a contextualized process. Like all aspects of schooling, teacher education is subject to political influence, power, and societal pressure. The San Antonio story also illustrates the effect that a political smear campaign can have on a strong-minded administrator with high ideals. Although he was a stalwart believer in the School of Methods, Wolfe significantly reduced the program after the 1906 school trustee election. The political interplay between superintendents, school boards, and local politicians remains a significant factor affecting professional development today. Lars Björk and John Keedy recently argued that, in order to work effectively with boards of education that possess differing ideologies, American superintendents need increased political

³¹² John Franklin Bobbitt, *The San Antonio Public School System: A Survey Conducted by J.F. Bobbitt*, (San Antonio: The San Antonio School Board, 1915), 211.

³¹³ Hanus, "That All May Learn", 693.

acumen and skill sets. Wolfe's story provides a historical example supportive of their argument.³¹⁴

This San Antonio story also illustrates how two superintendents with diametrically opposite ideologies, one "progressive" and one "traditional", met similar fates. Both made significant changes to continuing teacher education in San Antonio and both were forced from office because the changes they made were, perhaps, too drastic. This historical example speaks to a larger issue of educational reform. At first, it appears to illustrate the old pendulum cliché, of reform programs swinging from one extreme to the other. This seems particularly striking considering the fact that Lufkin's successor, Charles Meek (1915-1920), created the Southwest Texas Teacher Institutes, a professional development program that seemed to be a "reinvention" of Wolfe's School of Methods ten years later. As David Tyack and Larry Cuban point out, such large-scale reforms rarely succeed; rather, reforms that use gradual, "adaptive tinkering" are more successful at preserving what works and eliminating that which does not work.³¹⁵ Wolfe did not tinker. Rather, he attempted a transformation. This San Antonio account supports Tyack and Cuban's thesis that extreme reform movements, historically considered, have been unsuccessful. It also emphasizes that current educational reform cannot be ahistorical; examples from the past should play into choices about contemporary and future developments.

³¹⁴ Lars Björk and John Keedy, "Politics and the Superintendency in the USA: Restructuring In-Service Education", *Journal of In-Service Education* 27.2 (2001): 275-302.

³¹⁵ David Tyack and Larry Cuban, *Tinkering Toward Utopia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Like city teachers' institutes in Houston, the San Antonio School of Methods was highly specialized. In Houston, superintendents stressed educational theory as of prime importance to professional development. The chief focus of the San Antonio school targeted pedagogy—specifically, child-centered curriculum and manual training. Certainly, the San Antonio School of Methods was a special highlight, a worthy enterprise that was, perhaps, a breath of fresh air among the ordinary offerings of teachers' institutes. Conventional city institutes existed before the school, and returned again after the school died. To some degree, the San Antonio School of Methods was an anomaly. That is, not all Southwestern cities featured institutes with such a high degree of “specialness”. In Denver, for example, the summer normal institutes exhibited a balanced mix of pedagogy and content that exhibited none of the “specialness” present in San Antonio.

CHAPTER 4:

THE SUMMER NORMAL INSTITUTE IN DENVER, COLORADO

“What America has been to the world, Colorado has been to America”, boasted an early-twentieth century article in *The Rocky Mountain Educator*.³¹⁶ Coloradoans of the times prided themselves as possessing a spirit of adventure, an abundance of natural resources and a wealth of opportunity. In some respects, this characterization was accurate. Colorado was a hotbed of manufacturing due to a thriving coal industry which resulted in a steady stream of urban and rural growth from 1900 to 1930.³¹⁷ Nevertheless, the state suffered an economic depression in 1893, a decline in heavy metal mining at the turn-of-the-twentieth-century, and the separation of ethnic minorities into “remote southern mining communities”.³¹⁸ Consequently, public education in Colorado experienced unique challenges due to its’ fluctuating economy and the “constantly changing and rapidly increasing population” of the state.³¹⁹

³¹⁶ “The Genius of the People of Colorado”, *The Rocky Mountain Educator*, 15.3 (1909), 32.

³¹⁷ Robert Todd Laugen, “The Promise and Defeat of the Progressive Public: Reform Politics in Colorado, 1902-1929 (PhD dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 2005) 20-21

³¹⁸ Laugen, “Reform Politics in Colorado”, 20

³¹⁹ *Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado, December 1902* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company State Printers, 1902), 13.

The city of Denver was the financial, industrial, and transportation hub of Colorado during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. As the state capital of Colorado, Denver enjoyed a status as one the largest urban centers in the states west of the Mississippi River.³²⁰ In 1880, Denver's population was 35, 629 and the city's public schools served 3210 students.³²¹ When the population of the State of Colorado boomed at the end of the nineteenth century, so did the population of Denver. By 1890, Denver was the third largest city in the West, behind San Francisco and Omaha.³²² The burgeoning scholastic population necessitated an increased number of educational facilities. The district built at least one new school building each year through the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries. In 1912, the city included 71 school buildings that served 40, 201 students and 930 teachers. That year, African-Americans represented 888 of the 40, 201 students in Denver.³²³

Schools segregated by race did not exist in Denver during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries although most African-American students were enrolled in one of two schools due to residential segregation.³²⁴ Officially, African-American students were "received, enrolled and classified as are others, no distinction being permitted on account 'of race, color or previous condition of

³²⁰ Gerald D. Nash, "Research Opportunities in the Economic History of the Twentieth-Century West", *Researching Western History: Topics in the Twentieth Century* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 18.

³²¹ *Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Board of Education of School District No. One, Arapahoe County, Colorado* (1898),.

³²² Mauck, Laura. *Five Points Neighborhood of Denver*. (Chicago: Arcadia Publishing, 2001), 7.

³²³ *Ninth Annual Report of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado* (1912), 71.

³²⁴ See, for example, the *Seventeenth and Eighteenth Annual Reports of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado* (Denver: The Denver School Press, 1921) 13-16.

servitude.”³²⁵ In practice, whites considered African-Americans in Denver as “an entity apart from rest of the city free to operate as it wished within firm limits”.³²⁶ African-Americans who entered the Denver workforce usually held unskilled laborer positions.³²⁷ Consequently, although no extant sources specifically discuss the ethnicity of teachers employed by the Denver city schools in the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, all the city’s teachers in the city likely were Anglo.

Colorado did have a small Latino population at the turn-of-the-twentieth century. Like African-American students, Latino students attended non-segregated public schools and the state made occasionally made provisions concerning Spanish-speaking students. For example, The Colorado Teachers’ Association, at least during its inaugural year in 1875, had a “Committee on the Education of Spanish Pupils”.³²⁸ However, like the state of Texas, information regarding Latino Colorado teachers at the turn-of-the-twentieth century is possibly extant, but not readily available.

The city’s public school system followed the direction of a single superintendent, Aaron Gove (1873-1904), for thirty-one years. The “curmudgeonly” Gove, as educational historian David Gamson characterized the superintendent, managed a “Victorian school system—one in which little responsibility was delegated to teachers or other administrators”.³²⁹ Certainly, not until Gove left

³²⁵ *Seventh Annual Report of the Board of Education of District No. 1 Denver, August 1, 1881* (Denver: Times Steam Printing House, 1881), 29-30.

³²⁶ Carl Abbott, “Plural Society in Colorado: Ethnic Relations in the Twentieth Century,” *Phylon*, 39.3 (1978): 254

³²⁷ Abbott, “Plural Society in Colorado”, 254

³²⁸ *Education in Colorado: 1861-1885: A Brief History of the Early Educational Interests of Colorado, Together with a History of the State Teachers’ Association, and Short Sketches of Private and Denominational Institutions* (Denver: News Printing Company, 1885).

³²⁹ Gamson, “District By Design”, 152, 156.

Denver in 1904 did the city started a “fundamental shift” toward its’ contemporary reputation as a center of innovation in Progressive Era education.³³⁰

TYPES OF INSTITUTES IN DENVER

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the summer normal institute was the one type of teachers’ institute in Colorado. Indeed, it was probably the most significant form of in-service education in the state during this era. The Superintendent of Public Instruction often divided the state into six normal districts. However, Colorado was so large that distance precluded many teachers from regular attendance. One county superintendent joked, for example, that “his teachers are one hundred miles from the railroad and his institute district extends from Utah to Nebraska”.³³¹ In recognition of this problem, the state legislature increased the number of institute districts to thirteen, each comprising several different counties.³³² Each of these normal districts held an institute in the summer, commonly for two weeks in July or August. Superintendents of the participating counties elected a managing committee of three of their county superintendents to supervise institute operations.³³³ The purpose of these summer normal programs was to give teachers, especially those in rural areas, “a taste of the professional training afforded by the

³³⁰ Gamson, *District By Design*, 216.

³³¹ *Eighth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for the Biennial Term Ending December 1892* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1891), 20.

³³² *Seventh Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for the Biennial Term Ending June 30, 1890* (Denver: Collier and Cleaveland Lithographing Company, 1891), 251

³³³ *Report of an Inquiry Into the Administration and Support of the Colorado School System: Department of the Interior Bureau of Education Bulletin 1917, no. 5* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917), 78.

State Normal School, the privileges of which they may be unable to enjoy”.³³⁴ The city of Denver was the site of the Third District’s annual Institute, the largest summer normal program in the state of Colorado.³³⁵

In the early twentieth century, some Colorado legislators proposed the abolishment of this system of summer normals. Under their plan, teachers would be required to attend six-week normal institutes in the state’s normal schools in Gunnison or Greeley.³³⁶ Denver County Superintendent Mary Bradford (1909-1912) opposed this resolution:

While the district normal institutes may not be wholly adequate to the professional needs of teachers, yet they are improving each year, the faculties are larger and better equipped and the professional standards are being raised . . . These normal institutes reach a class of teachers who receive such small salaries, that it would be impossible for them to assume the necessary expense of a six weeks stay away from home. Therefore, if the Institutes are abolished these teachers must go without any summer professional training, at all . . . I know that many prominent educators are one with me on this important matter.³³⁷

Nevertheless, in 1917, the legislature created the longer, six-week summer normal institute course.³³⁸ This change most likely followed the recommendations of a 1916 study conducted through the federal Bureau of Education. The study suggested that Colorado abolish the prevailing two-week summer normal system and replace it with “six-week summer schools substituted at five or more points in the state selected

³³⁴ “Editorial”, *Colorado School Journal* 7.69 (1891): 1.

³³⁵ “Teachers: Tenth Annual Institute Begins July 19 in Denver”, *The Denver Evening Post*, July 6, 1897.

³³⁶ Denver County Superintendent Mary Bradford to Colorado Governor John F. Shafroth, June 2, 1911, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³³⁷ Mary Bradford to Colorado Governor John F. Shafroth, June 2, 1911.

³³⁸ *School Laws Annotated of 1917*, section 234b.

because of convenience of location”.³³⁹ Importantly, however, the state did not mandate the new form of the institute was not mandatory. It was offered in addition to the existing two to four week summer institute. The Colorado State Department of Education, consequently, organized and offered six of these longer institutes in regional location. Although the locations of some of these institutes changed from time to time, and as the laws stipulated, the central western institute was held at the state normal school in Gunnison and the northern Colorado district was held at the state normal in Greeley.³⁴⁰

Importantly, Colorado did not regularly hold county normal institutes in addition to the summer normal institutes. Although county superintendents initially held institutes, the practice declined in popularity after the state established a system on summer normal institute districts in 1888.³⁴¹ Even with this development, county superintendents had the authority to convene county institutes if they deemed them necessary.³⁴² Only rarely did Denver County superintendents exercise their authority. Superintendent Emma M. Herey (1899-1906) was an exception. In 1902, before the creation of Denver County, Herey organized Arapahoe County institutes monthly at the Denver courthouse.³⁴³

³³⁹ *Report of an Inquiry Into the Administration and Support of the Colorado School System*, 79.

³⁴⁰ *School Laws Annotated of 1917*, section 234b.

³⁴¹ Sixth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the state of Colorado for the Biennial Term Ending June 30, 1888 (Denver: The Collier and Cleaveland Lithographing Co, 1889), 46.

³⁴² Denver County Superintendent Lilian A. Field to Alice M. Sampson, County Superintendent of Schools, Cheyenne, Wyoming, April 10, 1906, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³⁴³ Denver County Superintendent Emma M. Herey to B.O. Aylesworth, President of the State Agricultural College, Fort Collins, Colorado, September 11, 1902, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

Denver's superintendent met with city teachers during a "general institute", usually held on the first Saturday of each month from September to May. At these meetings, several lecturers addressed the teachers, and, afterwards, teachers attended sectional meetings to discuss grade-level issues.³⁴⁴ Business-minded city superintendent Aaron Gove, not unlike San Antonio's Superintendent Wolfe, eschewed philosophy and theory, focused institute sessions towards efficient and practical pedagogy.³⁴⁵ Consequently, city institutes under Gove's lengthy administration (1873-1904) targeted classroom methods and teacher discussion. Superintendent Gove simply disliked delivering formal lectures.³⁴⁶ In 1908, Superintendent Charles Chadesy (1908-1912) cancelled the Denver city institutes and replaced them with office hours and a conference period, open to all teachers in the city.³⁴⁷ For the next two decades, Denver superintendents convened city institutes only "occasionally as may seem necessary or advisable".³⁴⁸ During the 1917-1918 school year, for example, Denver teachers attended only three

³⁴⁴ See, for example, *Second Annual Report of the Board of Education of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, September 30, 1905* (n.p., 1905), 9.

³⁴⁵ Barbara Berman, "Business Efficiency, American Schooling, and the Public School Superintendency" A Reconsideration of the Callahan Thesis", *History of Education Quarterly*, 23.3 (1893): 297-321.

³⁴⁶ Aaron Gove to Superintendent Charles C. Corey, President of the Nebraska Teachers' Association, Stanton, Nebraska, December 15, 1893. Denver Public Library, Aaron Gove Manuscript Collection.

³⁴⁷ *Fifth Annual Report of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, September 30, 1908* (Denver: Russell and Norman Printing, 1908), 13.

³⁴⁸ *Denver Public Schools, School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado Handbook: Officials and Teachers' General Information 1914-1915* (n.p.), 4.

institutes.³⁴⁹ These general meetings were usually “inspirational” rather than practical or theoretical.³⁵⁰

Colorado established a state Teachers’ Association in 1875.³⁵¹ Its annual meetings ordinarily were held in the city of Denver, although a few were held in Colorado Springs, Boulder, Greeley and Pueblo.³⁵² The association’s meetings included sessions devoted to several different special interest groups that included Kindergartens, arts and crafts, science, child study, modern language, music, classical and library.³⁵³ Because of the meeting’s location, Denver teachers could easily attend sessions as a form of professional development. To attend these meetings, teachers paid annual dues of one dollar to the Colorado State Teachers’ Association; or, become a life member of the association by paying dues of ten dollars in one sum.³⁵⁴ Most Denver teachers attended both the summer normal institute and the Colorado Teachers’ Association meeting each year.³⁵⁵

Practicing teachers in Denver also had the opportunity to take summer courses at two private city institutions. The Denver Normal and Preparatory School

³⁴⁹ *Fifteenth Annual Report of School District Number One in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, for the Year Ending on June Thirteenth Nineteen Eighteen* (n.p.), 15.

³⁵⁰ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for the Years 1907-1908* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1908), 61.

³⁵¹ *Proceedings of the First Annual Session of the Colorado Teachers’ Association, Boulder, January 3 and 4, 1877* (Denver: Tribune Stream Printing House, 1877), 1.

³⁵² *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for the Years 1905-1906* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, State Printers, 1906), 28.

³⁵³ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1905-1906*, 28.

³⁵⁴ *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado of December 1900* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1900), 479

³⁵⁵ *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1900*, 147.

and the Denver University both held summer sessions during June and July.³⁵⁶ The Denver Normal and Preparatory School, founded by Fred Dick in the late nineteenth century, offered Normal and Kindergarten coursework in special five-week summer sessions³⁵⁷. The school was an incorporated normal; that is, in addition to a normal course, students could take college preparatory and technical classes as well. Indeed, the Denver Normal and Preparatory School claimed coursework “fitting pupils for Yale and Harvard, or any other leading educational institution”.³⁵⁸ Denver University, another private institution in the city, offered summer normal course work as well. Of course, both institutions charged a tuition fee. However, as these two institutions were within city, Denver teachers could attend them without incurring expenses in the form of additional room, board and travel. Importantly, the dates of these summer courses sometimes conflicted with the third district normal institute dates; consequently, Denver teachers could not attend both courses in their entirety.

For a few years during the late-nineteenth century, the Denver School Board sponsored an evening lecture series that was free to interested teachers and citizens. Most of the lectures focused on cultural and historical topics, such as “Developments in the Style of Raphael” and “Extinct Monsters of Ancient Colorado”. Still, some of these lectures did relate to education, like a stereopticon presentation on “The

³⁵⁶ Denver County Superintendent Lilian A. Field to Miss Jeanette Aukema, Cedar Falls, Iowa, May 11, 1907. Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³⁵⁷ *Portrait and Biographical Record of Denver and Vicinity, Colorado* (Chicago: Chapman Publishing Company, 1898). 148.

³⁵⁸ *Portrait and Biographical Record*, 148.

Schools at Work”.³⁵⁹ City Superintendent Aaron Gove advertised these lectures as a form of professional development for Denver teachers. Clearly, they were not a part of the institute programming or its follow up. City teachers were not required to attend the evening lecture series. In fact, Colorado laws did not mandate attendance at any form of teachers’ institute.

COLORADO LAWS GOVERNING INSTITUTE WORK

Colorado teachers were not officially required to attend the summer normal institutes. “Attendance at the institute is in nowise compulsory”, Colorado Superintendent of Instruction Helen Loring Grenfell (1899-1905) explained in 1900, “The teacher may attend or not, as he sees fit”.³⁶⁰ County superintendents also were not required to attend the summer normals. Colorado law specified that superintendents were “not entitled either to mileage or a per diem compensation, though he is a member of the executive committee of the normal district”.³⁶¹ Colorado teachers did not receive a salary for their attendance at summer normal institutes.³⁶² Although many administrators urged the Colorado legislature to award teachers their regular salaries while attending the normal institutes, this plea never came to fruition.³⁶³ Attendees, importantly, did receive reduced rail fares for travel

³⁵⁹ “School Board Free Lectures”, *Twenty-Third Annual Report of the Board of Education of School District No. One of Arapahoe County* (n.p., 1897), 28.

³⁶⁰ *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1900*, 13.

³⁶¹ *The School Laws Annotated of the State of Colorado as Amended to Date January 1, 1912* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Company, 1912), section 148.

³⁶² *Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1902*, 231.

³⁶³ See, for example, Ira M. DeLong, “A Proposed Plan for a State System of Graded Institutes”, *The Colorado School Journal*, 6.59 (1890), 7; *Eighth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1892*, 259.

to and from their home and the site of the summer normal institutes that they attended.³⁶⁴

Over the course of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, the Colorado Office of Public Instruction published several different courses of study for summer normal institute work. Importantly, these courses were suggestive only. Institute officials could follow the suggestions, but the Office of Public Instruction's rules did not insist on compliance. The first guide, released in 1892, was based on institute work conducted in New York, Indiana, Michigan and Illinois.³⁶⁵ This guide included topics in subject matter (Psychology, Hygiene, History, Government, Ethics) and pedagogy (School Government, Methods of Instruction, The District Library). Importantly, this first guide also contained a list of "valuable books for instructors". A second suggested syllabus, released in 1894, eliminated pedagogical topics and focused solely on subject matter.³⁶⁶ State Superintendent Katherine L. Craig (1905-1909, 1921-1923, 1927-1931) issued the third suggested course of study in 1906.³⁶⁷ Craig provided alternate coursework for three different years of institute study, as well as afternoon break-out sessions for Primary and Grammar teachers.

³⁶⁴ "The Normal Institutes", *The Colorado School Journal*, 7.67 (1891), 1.

³⁶⁵ *Eighth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1892*, 260.

³⁶⁶ *Ninth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for December 1894* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1895), 98-115.

³⁶⁷ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1905-1906*, 132-166.

FINANCING THE INSTITUTE

In 1891, Colorado's legislature passed a bill that appropriated fifty dollars to each normal institute district that had a total attendance of at least twenty teachers.³⁶⁸ The legislature intended that this appropriation be used to pay institute expenses, including lecturer stipends, printing costs and teacher materials. In practice, however, the state usually contributed more than \$50.00. The actual amount fluctuated according to the state's budget. In 1903, for example, the state provided each of the summer normal districts \$192.37, whereas in 1904, the amount fell to \$177.79.³⁶⁹ This money went into the district's "Normal Institute Fund", which was jointly administered by the counties within the district. Counties contributed to this fund from their general education funds, as well. State law required each county to contribute to the institute fund \$2.00 for each teacher from that county who attended the summer normal. Teachers paid mandatory registration fees of \$1.00, an amount that helped pay for institute expenses not covered by the state's contribution. Furthermore, teachers who sat for a county examination offered at the institute paid an additional \$1.00 examination fee.³⁷⁰ Although this examination fee primarily went to cover expenses associated with sitting for the certification test, surplus monies could fund general institute costs.

Because of the high number of attendees at Denver County summer normal institutes, the normal institute fund that supported them generally maintained a positive cash balance. In order to save money on institute supplies, Denver County

³⁶⁸ "The Normal Institutes", *Colorado School Journal* 7.69 (1891): 4.

³⁶⁹ *Fourteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado December 1904* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1904), 76.

³⁷⁰ *Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1902*, 224.

superintendents requested donations of materials from textbook manufacturers and distributors with whom the district conducted business. In 1905, for example, the institute received three hundred free songbooks from the Baldwin Music Company and about the same number of dictionary booklets from G&C Merriman Company.³⁷¹ Most of the institute expenses were fees paid to instructors and lecturers. In 1899, for example, the Third District Normal paid instructors a total of \$1,100.00;³⁷² in 1910, instructors received \$1,069.75.³⁷³ Certainly, the summer normal institute the most expensive institute form in Colorado. Accordingly, the summer normal was also the most significant form of professional development available to practicing teachers in the city of Denver.

THE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF DENVER SUMMER NORMALS

The Denver County Summer Normal typically followed a two-week course. Each day of the institute opened at 8:40 AM. Attendees sang a song in unison, answered a roll call of residents, and listened to a short introductory address by one of the institute conductors. Subsequently, each day's work featured a morning session, a lunch break, and an afternoon session. The institute followed the schedule of subjects throughout the two-week institute, although individual lecture topics changed from day-to-day. For example, in 1892, teachers studied Primary Reading

³⁷¹ Denver County Superintendent Emma M. Herey to The Baldwin Music Company, Denver, Colorado, June 8, 1905, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records; Denver County Superintendent Emma M. Herey to G&C Merriman Company, Publishers, Springfield, Massachusetts, May 23, 1905, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³⁷² *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1900*, 284.

³⁷³ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1909-1910*, 97.

each morning from 10:50AM to 11:20AM, and Grammar or Geography each afternoon from 2:00 PM to 2:30 PM.³⁷⁴ These subject studies went into a great deal of detail; in Botany, for example, teachers studied the parts of a plant, plant ecology, and simple flora classifications.³⁷⁵ Through the turn of the century, Third District institutes continued a focus on academic knowledge that teachers would teach the following year in their individual classrooms.

In 1905, however, the content focus moved towards a focus on “the teaching process, and not the acquirement of knowledge of subject matter.”³⁷⁶ Teachers appreciated this change towards work that was increasingly “practical, methodological and inspirational”.³⁷⁷ State Superintendent Katherine M. Cook (1909-1911) supported this shift for all teachers’ institutes in Colorado and warned conductors not to use the summer normal as a place to “correct academic deficiencies” or as a place to “enable the individual to secure higher grades on examination”.³⁷⁸ Cook also suggested that institute instructors structure the normals in a way that allowed both new and experienced teachers to benefit from the work. In response, Denver County institute conductors shifted away from a rigid schedule of subjects, towards an elective course. Institute instructors provided teachers the opportunity to choose the sessions in which they were most interested in, with the exception of one required lecture on Psychology. “The committee felt,” explained a

³⁷⁴ *Eighth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1892*, 296.

³⁷⁵ *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1900*, 303.

³⁷⁶ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1905-1906*, 169.

³⁷⁷ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1907-1908*, 114.

³⁷⁸ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1909-1910*, 24.

1907 Third District institute report, “that every one should take the lectures on this subject, and therefore made it a requisite for credits”.³⁷⁹

The State Superintendent of Public Instruction recommended that summer normal institutes include discussion as well as lecture:

As the object of the institute is to aid each teacher in developing innate teaching ability, the work should be individual and personal in its character as far as possible. The spirit of inquiry should be encouraged. There should be frequent opportunities for questions and answers, for exchange of thought, for suggestions coming directly from the members of the class.³⁸⁰

The Denver County summer institutes ordinarily did not follow this suggestion and they retained a mostly lecture-based format. However, with the shift to an elective format in 1907, lecturers scheduled conference periods in order that interested teachers could “confer individually with the various instructors, at specified times, outside of the regular lecture periods”.³⁸¹

State Superintendent Nathan B. Coy (1891-1893) urged county superintendents to advertise the summer normal institutes heavily, in “local papers and otherwise”. Denver County Superintendents complied with this request by sending out stacks of institute announcements to principals of all the schools in the Third Normal District, as well as members of the high school Senior classes.³⁸² As a result, lectures at Denver summer institutes were generally “well-attended”, both by

³⁷⁹ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1907-1908*, 108.

³⁸⁰ *Eighth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1892*, 256.

³⁸¹ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1907-1908*, 108.

³⁸² Denver County Superintendent Lilian A. Field to Dr. Chasey, Denver, Colorado, March 13, 1906, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records; Denver County Superintendent Lilian A. Field to Denver City Superintendent L.C. Greenlee, Denver, Colorado, March 29, 1907, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

Denver teachers as well as visitors from other states.³⁸³ In 1906, for example, an article in *The Denver Evening Post* called attention to the “number of celebrated educators from different portions of the East” who attended the institute.³⁸⁴ In particular, guests from the city of Chicago attended and instructed the institutes frequently, including teachers from the Chicago normal schools and members of the Chicago Women’s Club.³⁸⁵

The Executive Committee of the Denver County summer normal, comprised of superintendents from Denver, Arapahoe and Adams counties, secured the lecturers for the annual Third District Normal Institute. For the most part, selections of the staff were based upon letters of recommendation sent to the executive committee by previous employers. Educators interested in securing instructor positions at the summer institute sent letters of intent along with references to one of the district’s county superintendents in order to express their interest. Sometimes the individual superintendent rejected the applicant outright, without forwarding the materials to the other superintendents who served on the executive committee: “It is a difficult thing,” wrote Denver County Superintendent Honora L. Macpherson, “to consider all the deserving subjects we would like in the short time of ten days”.³⁸⁶

³⁸³ “Decries Ways of Teachers: Lecturer at Normal Institute Attacks Modern Methods”, *The Denver Evening Post*, may 13, 1905.

³⁸⁴ “Third District Normal Begins July 9: Besides the Local Instructors, a Number of Educators From the East Will Be in Attendance”, *The Denver Evening Post*, July 17, 1906.

³⁸⁵ See, for example, Eleventh Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado December 1898 (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1898), 231-232; “Teachers: Tenth Annual Institute Begins July 19 in Denver”, *The Denver Evening Post*, Tuesday July 6, 1897.

³⁸⁶ Denver County Superintendent Honora L. Macpherson to Dr. William R. Callicotte, State Capitol, Denver, Colorado, May 10, 1913, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

On some occasions, the executive committee met to consider hiring the instructor.³⁸⁷ Superintendents hired out-of-state lecturers only rarely. Most lecturers came from normals, universities and districts around Colorado.

TEACHERS' INSTITUTES AND THE CERTIFICATION BONUS

Educators licensed to teach in Colorado held one of three types of teaching certificates.³⁸⁸ Graduates of university and normal school programs held a life-time normal school certificate. A passing score on a state examination granted a Colorado teacher a state certificate, also held for life. County superintendents issued county certificates, good for a limited number of years. Teachers who held county certificates possessed a "First Grade" certificate (a 3-year licensure), a "Second Grade" certificate (a 12 to 18 month licensure) or a "Third Grade" certificate (a 6 to 9 month licensure).³⁸⁹ The grade of the certificate depended on the marks teachers received on county examinations, given quarterly during the 1880's and three times a year starting in 1892.³⁹⁰ Importantly, teachers who chose to attend the summer normal institute received a 5 per cent bonus on any one county certification examination taken during the year following the institute.³⁹¹

³⁸⁷ Denver County Superintendent Mary Bradford to Mr. S Arthur Johnson, January 10, 1910, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³⁸⁸ Lynn M. Burlbaw, "Teacher Testing—Could You Pass the Test?". Paper presented at the Mid-America Conference on History, September 19-21, 2002, Fayetteville, Arkansas, 2.

³⁸⁹ Burlbaw, "Teacher Testing—Could You Pass the Test?", 2-3.

³⁹⁰ Burlbaw, "Teacher Testing—Could You Pass the Test?", 2.

³⁹¹ *The School Laws Annotated of the State of Colorado as Amended to Date June 30, 1917* (Denver: Eames Brothers, 1917), section 234a.

At first, county superintendents calculated the percentage bonus on the general average score received by the applicant.³⁹² However, later regulations modified the rule by specifying that the bonus of five percent was “a straight five per cent of one hundred, and not five per cent of the general average, for otherwise one teacher would receive more credit than another for attending such institute, which is not the intent of the law”.³⁹³ Importantly, county superintendents had the discretion to withhold the institute bonus from teachers who did not attend all sessions in their entirety.³⁹⁴ Some, like Denver county superintendent Lilian A. Field (1906-1909), used this statutory provision as an inducement to reduce tardiness of teachers at sessions. In a 1908 letter to an out-of-county teacher interested in attending the summer normal institute in Denver, Superintendent Field wrote:

If possible, I advise that you get here to attend the institute the first morning, June 15th. The committee does not like to grant the additional five per cent on examinations to those who have not attended the full time. Whether it would give special consideration to your case, I cannot say.³⁹⁵

The certification bonus also proved to be an incentive for new-to-profession teachers. State Superintendent Katherine M. Cook explained that the bonus encouraged “young and inexperienced persons who desire to become teachers to attend”.³⁹⁶

³⁹² *School Laws Annotated of 1912*, section 148. With this interpretation, for example, an applicant with a general average of 70% would receive a final score of 73.5% with the institute bonus.

³⁹³ *School Laws Annotated of 1917*, section 234a. With this interpretation, for example, an applicant with a general average of 70% would receive a final score of 75% with the institute bonus.

³⁹⁴ *Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for December 1902* (Denver: Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1902), 224.

³⁹⁵ Denver County Superintendent Lilian A. Field to Florence McMurtry, Pine, Colorado, May 27, 1908, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records.

³⁹⁶ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado for the Years 1909-1910* (Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company, 1910), 23.

HIGHER EDUCATION CREDIT FOR INSTITUTE WORK

One object of debate among Colorado administrators revolved around the awarding of higher education credits for work at summer normal institutes. Specifically, could teachers who attended an institute in its entirety, and received successful certificate of completion, be able to receive higher education credit for a course in Pedagogy? Proponents of higher education credits believed that such a program would entice experienced teachers to participate in summer teachers' institutes. Opponents of the idea generally believed that institute work was below the level of university course work, and, consequently, earning college or university credits for institute participation was undesirable.

The University of Boulder and the Denver Normal and Preparatory School were two of the Colorado universities and colleges that vehemently opposed allowing higher education credit for institute work. University of Boulder officials flatly rejected the idea. They asserted that "institutes can do their best work without dickering for credits. People should be hungry for information rather than hungry for credits".³⁹⁷ Officials of the Denver Normal and Preparatory School also refused to offer college credit for institute work. They noted that "the fields of the Colleges and Normal Schools are entirely different so that the Normal Institute is not justified in asking for credits in College".³⁹⁸ The state normal schools in Greeley and Gunnison, however, agreed to offer credits for "good institute work". President Kelley of the Colorado State Normal in Greeley explained that, "Normal School

³⁹⁷ Minutes from the Joint Meeting of County Superintendents, Institute Conductors and Instructors and the Education Council, Denver, Colorado, March 29-April 1, 1916, State Board of Education Minutes, Colorado State Archives.

³⁹⁸ Minutes from the Joint Meeting of County Superintendents, March 29-April 1, 1916.

work should be both academic and professional or vocational. Therefore, the Institutes and the Normal Schools are both vocational schools so Normal Schools can give credit for Institute work”.³⁹⁹

THE INSTITUTE WORKERS’ INSTITUTE

In 1908, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Katherine L. Craig created the Colorado Conference of Normal Institute Conductors, Instructors, and Superintendents; the meeting was, essentially, an institute for institute workers.⁴⁰⁰ The conference usually met twice each year, once in March and April and a second time in conjunction with the state Teachers’ Association. Conference participants discussed issues affecting professional development programs across the state of Colorado, specifically “institutes, summer and extension courses, reading courses and certificate regulations”.⁴⁰¹ The structure of the conference mirrored the format of summer normal institutes. Institute instructors from across the state presented lectures. These presentations were interspersed with musical interludes, luncheons and evening receptions.

Occasionally, the meetings were themed. The 1910 meeting, for example focused on ways to “save time” during institute instruction.⁴⁰² Most of the time, however, participants listened to presentations on a wide variety of issues. Some of

³⁹⁹ Minutes from the Joint Meeting of County Superintendents, March 29-April 1, 1916.

⁴⁰⁰ *Thirteenth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1902*, 102.

Unfortunately, available evidence does not note how long the Colorado Conference of Normal Institute Conductors, Instructors and Superintendents continued. Nor does the available evidence present reasons for its establishment and demise.

⁴⁰¹ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1907-1908*, 102.

⁴⁰² *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1909-1910*, 91-92.

the lectures were “how to” presentations, detailing ways to teach specific subjects at normal institutes; for example, “How I Teach Arithmetic in Institutes” and “How I Teach Geography in Institutes”.⁴⁰³ Some lectures discussed the merits of including specific subject study in the institute course; for example, “Shall Physical Education Be Given a Place in the Institute Program?” and “What Place Shall Institute Give to Art?”.⁴⁰⁴ Other lectures targeted general institute issues like “Has the Institute Work a Definite Aim?” and “Teachers’ Needs at Institutes”.⁴⁰⁵

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE SUMMER NORMAL INSTITUTES IN DENVER

Investigation into Denver summer normal institutes held during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries reveals an important shift in terms of content. Institutes initially focused on subject-matter, with the objective to prepare teachers for certification examinations. Much in part due to the efforts of State Superintendent Katherine M. Cook, over time, the focus of institutes shifted from academic to professional. Cook stressed “history of education, psychology, methods of instruction, inspirational lectures, and such professional work” rather than “the usual academic routine”.⁴⁰⁶ After this push, Denver summer institutes were well-balanced in terms of the mix between subject-matter, pedagogy, theory and

⁴⁰³ Minutes from the Joint Meeting of County Superintendents, Institute Conductors and Instructors and the Education Council, Denver, Colorado, April 22, 1915, State Board of Education Minutes, Colorado State Archives.

⁴⁰⁴ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1909-1910*, 92.

⁴⁰⁵ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1907-1908*, 106.

⁴⁰⁶ *Report of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction 1909-1910*, 24.

inspiration. Importantly, even though certification exams were connected to the summer institutes, Denver institutes did not concentrate attention on test preparation.

The debate that surfaced regarding higher education credit for institute work presents an interesting insight into teacher education in Colorado. Fred Dick, a former state superintendent of Colorado and founder of the Denver Normal and Preparatory School, created the school because of his distaste with conventional Colorado teacher preparation. Consequently, Dick vehemently opposed the association of his school with state normals and institute work. The debate's resolution probably increased the chasm between the universities (University of Boulder and the Denver Normal and Preparatory School) and the state teachers' colleges in Greeley and Gunnison. The officers of the state teachers' colleges, who felt justified awarding normal school credit for institute work, may have very well been correct. However, they lost the battle of prestige.

The Denver story provides an example of how teachers' institutes formed in an educational situation with unique organizational support for professional development. That is, the Denver County superintendent, along with two others, as a function of legislative action, organized and operated the annual summer normal institutes. Officially, the three superintendents worked together to determine offerings, appoint lecturers and structure the work. In practice, however, it seems that superintendents serving on the executive committee could make decisions individually. Furthermore, they were not required to attend the summer normal institutes; if they chose to attend, they were not financially compensated for their involvement. The three superintendents, in a sense, became a kind of intermediate

authoritative body for institutes; that is, intermediate between the state and the county. However, no one was officially in charge. There existed no guiding emphasis and no special concerns by individual superintendents, as in San Antonio and Houston. Still, in Denver, the institutes were organized in structure and balanced in content due to financial and administrative assistance from the Colorado State Board of Education. Importantly, not all Southwestern cities were part of a state system that offered such strong support. In New Mexico, for example, a generally disorganized state system of education and inadequate financial assistance for the professional development of teachers presented a critical problem for teachers' institutes.

CHAPTER 5:

THE COUNTY INSTITUTE

IN SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO

The history of New Mexico, according to John Mondragón and Ernest Stapleton, is the story of a forgotten place, one that “suffered from institutionalized neglect and indifference from governing authorities, first from Spain, then from Mexico, and later from the United States of America”.⁴⁰⁷ This indifference carried over to the system of public education in New Mexico, as well. “The United States have neglected the education of our people,” Territorial Superintendent Manuel de Baca (1898-1901) explained, “and we have been left to work out our own salvation as best we might under peculiar and difficult circumstances”.⁴⁰⁸ Federal negligence towards the New Mexican educational system resulted in a paucity of finances, a decentralized school system, and a turbulent move towards statehood. Certainly, a lack of finances was the greatest obstacle impeding educational progress in the New Mexico territory.⁴⁰⁹ When the territorial legislature established a common school system in 1891, the public tax base was so low that it barely could support school

⁴⁰⁷ John B. Mondragón and Ernest S. Stapleton, *Public Education in New Mexico* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2005), 1.

⁴⁰⁸ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1899* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1900), 8.

⁴⁰⁹ Lynne Marie Getz, *Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850-1940* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997), 13.

expenditures even in the most densely populated areas of the territory.⁴¹⁰ With the leadership of two particularly strong territorial superintendents of education, Amando Chaves (1891-1897, 1904-1905) and Hiram Hadley (1905-1907), New Mexican public schools survived the turn-of-the-twentieth century.⁴¹¹ Still, they never truly prospered. When the United States granted New Mexico statehood in 1912, Assistant State Superintendent John V. Conway labeled the condition of the public schools “deplorable”, especially those in rural areas.⁴¹²

Urban school systems improved more quickly than those in rural areas because their tax-base, though initially small, grew substantially across the years. The cities of Santa Fe, Albuquerque and Las Vegas were the major urban centers of New Mexico during the late nineteenth century. In 1900, Santa Fe was the largest city in the territory, with technological conveniences like streetlights, telephones and railway service.⁴¹³ At the turn of the century, the incorporated city schools of Santa Fe served 520 pupils and 9 teachers in 9 different schools.⁴¹⁴

At the turn-of-the-twentieth century in Santa Fe, less than 1 per cent of the students were “native Negro”.⁴¹⁵ In New Mexico, areas with low populations of African-American students tended to leave them integrated in the general school

⁴¹⁰ Mondragón and Stapleton, *Public Education in New Mexico*, 134-135.

⁴¹¹ Tom Wiley, *Public School Education in New Mexico*, (Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Printing Plant, 1965), 25-26.

⁴¹² Wiley, *Public School Education in New Mexico*, 27.

⁴¹³ Charlotte Whaley, *Nina Otero-Warren of Santa Fe* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1994), 51.

⁴¹⁴ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1899* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1900), 13.

⁴¹⁵ *Eleventh Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 135.

system, rather than creating segregated schools.⁴¹⁶ To be sure, this decision was budgetary rather than explicitly educational. In Santa Fe, numbers of African-American students were particularly low. These students attended school with the rest of the scholastic population, and were instructed by Anglo teachers who attended the general county institutes.

Many Native American students in Santa Fe attended the Santa Fe Indian School. The school was not a part of the Santa Fe school system and its teachers were involved in a separate school system. The school, established in 1890, housed mostly Pueblo, Apache and Navajo students in a boarding school setting.⁴¹⁷ The goal of the school was Americanization and assimilation of the Native American students. During the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, all of the school's teachers were Anglo and they attended federal government teachers' institutes sponsored by the Department of the Interior. On occasion, teachers from the Indian School contributed to the Santa Fe County teachers' institutes.⁴¹⁸

A series of railroad "boom and bust" years caused the Santa Fe to reach a state of "economic stagnation" at the close of the nineteenth-century.⁴¹⁹ Tourism, coupled with an ambitious city improvement plan that focused on restoration and architectural style, gradually helped to revitalize the city. Even school construction plans played into this focus on tourism development. For example, in 1909, plans

⁴¹⁶ Ellis O. Knox, "Racial Integration in the Public Schools of Arizona, Kansas and New Mexico", *The Journal of Negro Education*, 23.3 (1954): 290-295.

⁴¹⁷ Sean Patrick Sullivan, "Education Through Sport: Athletics in American Indian Boarding Schools of New Mexico, 1885-1940" (PhD dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 2004), 48.

⁴¹⁸ "Teachers' Institute Notes", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 27, 1909.

⁴¹⁹ Chris Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1997) 78, 80

for new school buildings exhibited a Mission Style architecture.⁴²⁰ City planners promoted this architectural style, brought to New Mexico from California in 1897, as part of the revitalization project; architects described the Mission Style as having “Spanish Colonial associations” and “a picturesque Southwestern image”.⁴²¹ The city’s economy gradually stabilized and by 1920, many New Mexicans considered the Santa Fe County school system one of the best in the state.⁴²²

TYPES OF INSTITUTES IN SANTA FE

Practicing teachers in New Mexico took part in a system of county institutes. County superintendents ordinarily held these meetings in late August, before the start of the scholastic year. At the close of each institute, teachers could opt to take an examination to improve or renew their certification. During the first part of the twentieth century, New Mexico territorial school superintendents released a specific course of study for county institute work. The course focused heavily on subject matter, including topics in Arithmetic, Grammar, History, Physiology, Biology, Geography, Physical Culture and Reading. The required syllabus also included provisions for shorter discussions about pedagogy and class management.⁴²³ The Office of Public Instruction distributed a lengthy course of study manual for teachers’ institutes to all county superintendents in the territory and the Territorial Superintendent expected compliance with its provisions. The manual, relatively costly to produce at a price of some \$300 annually, eventually was distributed free to

⁴²⁰ Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe*, 92.

⁴²¹ Wilson, *The Myth of Santa Fe*, 91.

⁴²² Whaley, *Nina Otero-Warren*, 111.

⁴²³ *1905 Course of Study for County Institutes Prepared by the Territorial Board of Education* (Santa Fe: The New Mexican Printing Company, 1905).

interested teachers as well as to superintendents.⁴²⁴ James E. Clark, Territorial Superintendent from 1907 to 1912, explained the importance of following the proscribed courses of study:

No person, however well equipped, should attempt institute work without special study of the institute outline. We are fully convinced that much of the desultory work done in the institutes throughout the country is due to the fact that many conductors fail to master the course of study and to adapt their work to it, inserting instead their own peculiar ideas of institute work.⁴²⁵

Teachers could be excused from participation in their local county institute in one of three ways: if they presented a certificate from another two-week county institute in New Mexico, if they attended a university or state normal summer course, or, if they attended a summer normal institute.⁴²⁶ Territorial summer normal meetings did not operate under a system distinct from county institutes, like those in Texas. Rather, a district could elect to hold a longer, four-week “summer institute” instead of a shorter, two-week “county institute”. Teachers in counties that did not hold a summer county institute could choose to attend one in a neighboring county. The summer institutes tended to follow the same course of study as did the two-week county institutes, but the four week system allowed teachers two additional weeks for subject study. The summer institute was to follow a format much like a formal university or state sponsored normal school summer course: “The four-weeks’

⁴²⁴ *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of New Mexico for the Years 1910-1911 and 1911-1912* (New Mexican Printing Company, 1913), 36.

⁴²⁵ *1907 Course of Study for County Institutes of the Territory of New Mexico Compiled by the Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction* (n.p.: Territorial Board of Education, 1907), 6.

⁴²⁶ Alvan N. White, *Compilation of the Public School Laws of New Mexico 1915* (Denver: The W.H. Courtwright Publishing Company, 1916), 9. University and state normal courses were offered at University of New Mexico, the New Mexico Normal School in Silver City and the New Mexico Normal University in Las Vegas. Teachers who attended these institutes paid costs of their own tuition, room, board and travel.

institute”, Territorial Superintendent Alvin N. White (1912-1916) explained, “is in reality a summer school”.⁴²⁷

Santa Fe teachers also participated in institutes organized and operated by the city’s schools. The number of meetings held each year fluctuated with individual city superintendents; nevertheless, city teachers met at least bimonthly. These meetings tended to focus on methods and pedagogy.⁴²⁸ Legally, teachers who attended a city institute could be excused from county institute attendance.⁴²⁹ Santa Fe superintendents, however, city superintendents encouraged attendance of the city teachers at both city and county institutes.

Teachers who did not work in a semi-urban area sometimes participated in sectional meetings instead of city institutes.⁴³⁰ Rural county superintendents divided groups of teachers into several sections based on their location within the county. These regional sections met in addition to county institutes. Essentially, these sectional meetings, which were local in nature, became the equivalent of a city institute for non-urban areas. Nina Otero-Warren, Santa Fe County Superintendent in 1917 to 1929, explained the benefit of these sectional meetings: “It is not fair,” she said, “to send a teacher to an isolated district and then forget all about her except for an occasional visit by the superintendent”.⁴³¹

⁴²⁷ *1913-1914 Manual for County Institutes for the State of New Mexico* (East Las Vegas, NM: The Optic Publishing Company Printers, 1913), 10-11.

⁴²⁸ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1895* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1896), 30.

⁴²⁹ *Compilation of the School Laws of the Territory of New Mexico 1903* (Santa Fe: El Boletín Popular Printing Company, 1903), section 1613.

⁴³⁰ *Department of Education Educational News Bulletin* 2.11 (1918), 9.

⁴³¹ “County Institutes and Teachers’ Meetings”, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 15.5 (1919), 23.

NEW MEXICO LAWS GOVERNING INSTITUTE WORK

County teachers' institutes began with the establishment of the school system in 1891; however, due to a lack of funds, not every county held an institute during the next three years.⁴³² Not until 1897 did the New Mexican Territorial legislature officially authorize county superintendents to hold an annual two-week county institute. Many county superintendents, however, chose not to hold an annual institute. Moreover, attendance at these early county institutes was generally low. One reason for the low attendance was that teachers themselves were not notified of institute dates far enough in advance.⁴³³ More significantly, however, nineteenth-century New Mexican legislation did not require teacher attendance. In fact, Edward L. Bartlett, Solicitor General of New Mexico from 1890 to 1902, ruled that administrators could not lawfully punish teachers for failing to attend the county institute.⁴³⁴ Although the 1915 Public School Laws of New Mexico did make attendance at county institutes compulsory, no negative ramifications were developed for teachers who failed to attend.⁴³⁵

Without official legal enforcement from the territorial legislature, the territorial and county superintendents could do little to influence teacher attendance at the institutes. Teachers who missed either a two-week or four-week county institute usually commonly were considered to have feigned a generic illness as an

⁴³² *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1893* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1894), 6.

⁴³³ *Eleventh Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of New Mexico, December 1901* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1902).

⁴³⁴ "Normal Institutes: Teachers Should Attend Them, Although the Law is not Compulsory", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 23, 1898.

⁴³⁵ White, *Compilation of the Public School Laws of New Mexico 1915*, section 4813.

excuse. Territorial Superintendent James E. Clark described this problem in a 1908 letter to county superintendents:

What I shall insist upon is regular attendance. Last year in some counties not more than on-half of the teachers attended the institute and excuses of the following nature poured into the office: 'Please excuse my absence from the county institute on account of sickness'. So many excuses were worded in this same way that we are convinced that the majority of them would not stand the test of investigation . . . I have decided to not accept a statement of sickness as excuse for nonattendance at a county institute unless said excuse is accompanied by a physician's certificate. The county institute is a business proposition and must be handled as such.⁴³⁶

After Clark pushed county superintendents to "co-operate more fully with this department in enforcing the law concerning institute attendance" in this way, attendance improved by about 33%.⁴³⁷ Some county superintendents, like Santa Fe County Superintendent John V. Conway, announced that they would not issue teaching permits to teachers who failed to attend the annual institute.⁴³⁸ Whether or not these superintendents actually followed up with this pledge in practice is unclear.

FINANCING THE INSTITUTES

Each county supported its institutes financial through the resources of the "County Institute Fund". The New Mexican territorial legislature required that the county treasurer allocate money from the general school fund to the institute fund

⁴³⁶ J.E. Clark to County Superintendents, June 3, 1908, New Mexico Department of Education Records, New Mexico State Library.

⁴³⁷ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction Territory of New Mexico for the Biennial Period Ending June 15, 1908* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1909), 14. Attendance at 1907 county institutes was 665 teachers, which improved to 945 teachers in 1908.

⁴³⁸ "Santa Fe County Annual Institute", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 12, 1907.

each year, an amount determined by the county population.⁴³⁹ Furthermore, institute participants contributed to the fund through a compulsory registration fee that ranged from \$1.00 to \$3.00.⁴⁴⁰ Territorial Superintendents lobbied for the removal of the teacher tuition fee.⁴⁴¹ To “pay a fee to defray the expenses of the institute”, Territorial Superintendent Manuel deBaca believed, was something that “many teachers cannot do”.⁴⁴²

New Mexican teachers did receive some financial help with institute attendance. Railroads offered slightly discounted fares for travel, when county teachers purchased a total of at least fifty tickets.⁴⁴³ Teachers who attended the regular two-week institute for their county did not receive a salary for attendance; however, those who chose to attend a four-week summer institute were paid \$15.00 for their attendance.⁴⁴⁴

The county institute fund generally proved to be enough money to pay for the yearly meetings. For the 1910 Santa Fe County institute, for example, the county superintendent stayed just within budget:

⁴³⁹ *Compilation of the School Laws of the Territory of New Mexico 1903*, Section CXX. The laws instructed counties of the first class to set aside \$100, counties of the second class \$75, and counties of the third class \$50.

⁴⁴⁰ White, *Compilation of the Public School Law 1903*, section 4814.

⁴⁴¹ See, for example, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory of New Mexico for the Biennial Period ending June 15, 1910* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1911), 30.

⁴⁴² *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1898*: 9, 10.

⁴⁴³ “The Normal Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 11, 1902.

⁴⁴⁴ It is not clear if teachers who attended all four weeks without missing a day still had to pay the institute fee.

| | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| Institute Conductors Salaries . . . | \$185.00 |
| Janitor stipend . . . | \$12.00 |
| Advertising . . . | \$0.00 |
| Cost of printing manuals . . . | \$15.60 |
| Misc supplies . . . | 18.80 |
| Total expenditures . . . | \$231.40 |
| Total in County Institute Fund . . . | \$236.40 |
| Total balance on hand . . . | \$5.00 ⁴⁴⁵ |

However, financial problems did arise when counties hired expensive visiting lectures. New Mexico Superintendent of Public Instruction Hiram Hadley explained this problem in a letter to county superintendents: “In some instances last year exorbitant and unwise salaries were paid. This matter will be carefully scrutinized by this department during the coming year”.⁴⁴⁶ Counties solved the problem of paying for numerous speakers in several creative ways. Santa Fe County, for example, supplemented speakers’ salaries through a series of optional evening lectures offered during the institute session; in 1902, for example, admission tickets to each lecture cost 33 cents.⁴⁴⁷ At other times, visiting lecturers received a donated gift in lieu of a salary. At a Santa Fe County institute in 1901, for example, County Superintendent John V. Conway presented a visiting speaker from the New Mexico Normal School in Silver City with a gold-headed cane.⁴⁴⁸ Sometimes, teachers themselves raised money to purchase the presents.⁴⁴⁹

⁴⁴⁵ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction 1910*, appendix.

⁴⁴⁶ Hiram Hadley to New Mexico County Superintendents, January 15, 1907, New Mexico Department of Education Records, New Mexico State Library.

⁴⁴⁷ “The Normal Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 11, 1902.

⁴⁴⁸ “The Normal Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 30, 1901.

⁴⁴⁹ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 28, 1909.

THE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF SANTA FE COUNTY INSTITUTES

Santa Fe County institutes were initially held in August for two-week sessions. In 1909, the county moved to a system of extended four-week “summer county normals”. Furthermore, in 1916, county teachers voted to increase the institute length to eight weeks; in actuality, however, subsequent institutes were closer to six-weeks in length.⁴⁵⁰ The institute day generally began with an 8:00 AM morning session. Teachers first heard a welcoming address, a song, and, sometimes, “the repetition of a thought gem”.⁴⁵¹ After the opening, teachers spent the rest of the morning’s session listening to lectures on subject-matter covering topics from the official course of study. Most of the lectures were quite specific, involving, for example, solving sample arithmetic problems or parsing sentences in literary selections. After a lunch break, afternoon activities varied. Some afternoons teachers spent time with informal activities like folk dance lessons or a spelling competition.⁴⁵² Most afternoons, however, teachers were given time off to study for certification examinations.⁴⁵³ Those who wished to attempt institute “honors”—that is, a first grade certificate—sometimes returned for an extra study session from 2:00 to 4:00 PM.⁴⁵⁴

⁴⁵⁰ See, for example, “Express Marked Appreciation For Success of Institute: Santa Fe Teachers Declare They Have Accomplished More in Six Weeks Than Upon Previous Occasions”, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 16.1 (1919). 18; “Educational Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 28, 1917.

⁴⁵¹ “County Normal Institute: Annual Session Opened This Morning” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 15, 1898.

⁴⁵² “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 16, 1909; “Institute Teaches Teachers to Teach Children To Play; Folk Dance Feature”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 12, 1919.

⁴⁵³ “Santa Fe County Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 15, 1905; “County Teachers’ Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 13, 1904; “Teachers’ Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 17, 1903.

⁴⁵⁴ “Santa Fe County Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 12, 1907.

One interesting feature of the Santa Fe County institutes was a model class held in a classroom at the high school. The first model class, started in 1909, was considered by many as a great success.⁴⁵⁵ Institute teachers used the classroom to practice teaching young pupils how to read using a new method—“teaching by words without the alphabet”.⁴⁵⁶ In order to convince children to undertake scholastic work during vacation time, participating students were given a “prize”.⁴⁵⁷ Subsequent superintendents continued the model classes, albeit irregularly. Most of these model classes focused on primary coursework.⁴⁵⁸

During World War I, institute content shifted away from examination preparation. Institutes featured war-related lectures and patriotic addresses. Teachers sang patriotic songs, like “America”, “The Stars and Stripes Forever”, and “Star Spangled Banner”.⁴⁵⁹ In the afternoons, teachers were “trained in all kinds of war work” like canning and sewing.⁴⁶⁰ Teachers attending wartime institutes in Santa Fe resolved to “stimulate interest in our community to instill patriotism and to resent any unpatriotic actions or utterances” and released official statements to the press supporting war efforts.⁴⁶¹

⁴⁵⁵ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 16, 1909.

⁴⁵⁶ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 18, 1909.

⁴⁵⁷ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 26, 1909.

⁴⁵⁸ “Institute Teaches Teachers to Teach Children To Play; Folk Dance Feature”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 12, 1919.

⁴⁵⁹ “County Teachers’ Institute Has Fine Programs”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 25, 1918;

⁴⁶⁰ “Ninety Teachers to Attend Four Week’s Teachers’ School Here: Santa Fe Institute Opens, Others in Full Swing Over State”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 3, 1918; “Good Speakers at County Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 26, 1917; “County Institute Commences Six Weeks’ Session Here Monday Morning: Home-Making to Be Emphasized”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 7, 1919.

⁴⁶¹ “Rural Teachers of Santa Fe Close Institute”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 29, 1918; “Santa Fe County”, *New Mexico Journal of Education* 13.2 (1916).

The Santa Fe County institutes often were visited by educators and officials from other parts of the territory. High ranking officials were particularly likely to visit; for example, the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Governor, members of the Territorial Board of Education, and instructors from the territory's normal schools and universities. However, Santa Fe County institutes rarely featured visiting lectures from outside of New Mexico. One of the few scholars who did visit was Dr. Winfred.E. Garrison, President of Butler College in Indiana.⁴⁶² Garrison, a former History professor, spoke to the teachers about the benefits of a liberal arts education. Another year, an international scholar visited Santa Fe—Henri Deschamps, a physiognomist from Paris, France. Deschamps spoke at an evening lecture open by ticket only; proceeds from his lecture went to the public school library.⁴⁶³

Santa Fe County superintendents encouraged teacher attendance by their own heavy participation in the institute. Generally, county superintendents gave at least one address each day. County Superintendent John V. Conaway, for example, was particularly involved at institute proceedings; he attended all sessions and participating in activities alongside the Santa Fe teachers. "The teachers," one 1909 *Santa Fe New Mexican* newspaper article explained, "were very much encouraged in seeing their superintendent going to school daily with his books under his arm just as

⁴⁶² "Santa Fe County Teachers' Institute", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 21, 1905.

⁴⁶³ "The Normal Institute: A Number of Noted People Will Participate and Insure Its Success", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 11, 1903.

a bright school boy does”.⁴⁶⁴ That same year, the county superintendent and his wife both took the examination and “were very successful”.⁴⁶⁵

Teachers participated in social gatherings in the evenings after institute sessions concluded. Sometimes, these events were quite informal—for example, the serving of evening refreshments in a room at the high school.⁴⁶⁶ Others were more organized, like a comedy routine at the county courthouse by “funny man” Edward F. Dunlavy from Kings College in Pennsylvania and a moonlit hay ride through the city of Santa Fe.⁴⁶⁷ One evening, after a party at the city superintendent’s home, a group of institute teachers were caught outdoors in a rainstorm. The *Santa Fe New Mexican* reported about the event, perhaps to squelch any rumors that may have arisen about a group of school teachers unescorted after midnight:

When it began to rain, they were nearing the capitol and it was suggested that they go to the executive mansion, ask the Governor for shelter and pay him a midnight visit, or go the capitol and entertain the night watchman. They finally decided to go to the capitol, but, oh the poor watchman, he was so frightened when he that bunch of people coming in at so late an hour that he didn’t know exactly what to do, to chase them away or give them a welcome. But when he saw their faces he at once knew that they were either teachers or other people of culture, although they looked a little like fishes taken out from the sea all wet. The watchman congratulated himself for admitting them as they gave an impromptu reception to him. They sang all kinds of college songs, among them the teachers’ favorite song ‘The Hoolies’. It was a little after midnight when the rain ceased and they left for their homes.⁴⁶⁸

⁴⁶⁴ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 27, 1909

⁴⁶⁵ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 28, 1909.

⁴⁶⁶ “Normal Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 17, 1901.

⁴⁶⁷ “Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 21, 1903; “County Teachers’ Institute Has Fine Programs”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 25, 1918.

⁴⁶⁸ “Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 26, 1909.

These social activities provided Santa Fe teachers with an important distraction, since they spent much of the institute day studying for certification examinations.

THE TEACHERS' INSTITUTE AND CERTIFICATION EXAMINATIONS

Teachers who were interested in acquiring or improving their county certifications could take the appropriate examinations on the last Friday and Saturday of the county institutes. Teachers, sitting at desks, used pen and ink to answer questions that were written on classroom blackboards. Examiners collected the papers and took them to territorial representatives for grading. Teachers who scored an average of 90 percent or above (with no grade below 70) received a first grade county certificate, good for three years. Those scoring an average of 70 per cent or above (with no grade below 50) earned a second grade certificate, good for two years. Those falling below 70 per cent but still earning a "fair grade" received a third grade certificate, which had to be renewed the following year.⁴⁶⁹ In order to sit for a certification exam, a teacher must have attended the just completed institute session in its entirety. Test results for each examined individual were generally printed in the Superintendent of Public Instruction's annual or biannual report. During the 1907-1908 school year, for example, 24 examinations were given at the county institute in Santa Fe. Of those 24, 8 teachers failed, 0 earned first grade county certificates, 4 earned second grade county certificates, and 12 earned third

⁴⁶⁹ "Institute Notes", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 27, 1903.

grade county certificates.⁴⁷⁰ Teachers were often eager to improve their certificates because salaries were scaled according to the type of certificate a teacher held.

The problem with the linking the certification examination with the institute was that not all teachers had to retake an exam each year. Teachers who held either first or second grade county certificates, for example, were frustrated about the necessity of their attending institutes that were mainly focused on “cramming for examinations”.⁴⁷¹ Indeed, the course of study for New Mexico County institutes, focused on subject matter mastery for the exam. As a solution to this problem, teachers suggested moving the certification exams to the close of an eight-week long summer institute sponsored by the State. Teachers not taking an exam instead could attend a shorter, “inspirational, demonstrational institute” during or just prior to the first week of school. These teachers would face “no rehearsal of mere textbook facts, and no work to do outside the institute hours, which leaves them [teachers] free for relaxation and recreational activities.”⁴⁷² After 1918, several county superintendents employed this plan with reported success. “There were no examinations”, explained one county superintendent, “thus lifting from the teachers the burden that often spoils institute attendance for them”.⁴⁷³

⁴⁷⁰ *Seventeenth and Eighteenth Annual Reports of the Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of New Mexico for the Years 1907-1908* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1909), 38.

⁴⁷¹ “The Inspirational Institute, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 14.7 (1918).

⁴⁷² Lacy Sims, “County Institutes”, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 14.8 (April 1918).

⁴⁷³ “County Institutes and Teachers’ Meetings”, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 15.5 (1919), 23.

THE SPANISH LANGUAGE AND THE INSTITUTE

Mexican-American teachers attended teachers' institutes with Anglo teachers, and, in many cases, took leadership roles and held institute conductor positions. Indeed, early New Mexican territorial superintendents were all of Mexican origin. Amado Chaves, the first Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Mexico, was "Spanish in blood and Catholic in religion".⁴⁷⁴ Chaves championed the rights of Spanish-speaking teachers and encouraged the use and discussion of Spanish in the teachers' institute. Certainly, teachers at institutes discussed issues affecting Spanish-speaking pupils and bilingual education.⁴⁷⁵ Mexican-American teachers continued to attend and lead teachers' institutes in Santa Fe through the first two decades of the twentieth centuries.

In some respects, the lack of federal involvement in public education during the early territorial period yielded an increased greater freedom for individual teachers to explore bilingual education. The possibility existed for teachers to use Spanish in their classrooms. Furthermore, many territorial superintendents encouraged the use of the Spanish language in instruction. Amado Chaves, Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction from 1891 to 1897 and again from 1904 to 1905, was particularly vehement in his crusade supporting the use of Spanish in New Mexican public schools:

⁴⁷⁴ Wiley, *Public School Education in New Mexico*, 25.

⁴⁷⁵ See, for example, "Governor Addresses County Institute", *Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 8, 1919.

It is a crime against nature and humanity to try and rob the children of New Mexico of this, their natural advantage, of the language which is their's [sic] by birth-right, to deprive them unjustly of the advantages, great and numerous, which those have who command speech in two languages. English and Spanish are to go hand in hand in our schools, and only the height of bigotry and supine ignorance will or can ever affirm that the possessor of more than one language is unfit to be a good citizen . . . he who teaches in districts where Spanish is generally spoken must have a knowledge of it, so as to be able to teach intelligently.⁴⁷⁶

Indeed, several laws passed during the early twentieth century made provisions for bilingual education.⁴⁷⁷

The territorial government, thus extolling the virtues of Spanish-language instruction for New Mexican students, provided language resources to individual teachers through the institute system. Advertisements for many of the summer normal institutes were written in both English and Spanish.⁴⁷⁸ These institutes offered instruction appeared in both Spanish and English. Institute conductors urged English speakers to participate in Spanish sections: "It being required by law that in Spanish speaking districts, the teacher should have knowledge of both English and Spanish, it makes it imperative upon those who know only English, to apply themselves to the Spanish course of the normal".⁴⁷⁹ At some of these institutes, furthermore, teachers could pay an extra fee and take private language lessons in

⁴⁷⁶ *Territory of New Mexico Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1896* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1896), 9.

⁴⁷⁷ Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, 32. It was not until the 1920's that officials began to suppress Spanish-language instruction in the state of New Mexico.

⁴⁷⁸ See, for example "Second Annual Session of the Summer Normal School For Teachers and Those Preparing for Teaching at the City of Las Vegas, N.M." and "Segunda Sesión Anual de la Escuela Normal de Verano Para Preceptores y Para Aquellos que Deseen Enseñar Ciudad de Las Vegas, N.M." from June 6, 1892 to July 13, 1892. Fray Angélico Chávez History Library and Photo Archives

⁴⁷⁹ "Second Annual Session . . . at the City of Las Vegas, N.M.", 8.

either English or Spanish.⁴⁸⁰ Not all institutes offered dual-language instruction, however. In Santa Fe County, institutes were English only. “Of course the Institute is always harder for the Spanish-speaking teachers than for the English-speaking teachers,” one *Santa Fe New Mexican* newspaper reported, “As the Spanish teachers are dealing with a foreign language, it is hard for them”.⁴⁸¹

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE SANTA FE COUNTY INSTITUTES

This Santa Fe story illustrates well what happened when certification exams were linked with teachers’ institutes. The exams began to guide the content of the institute, and teachers spent most of their time studying subject matter instead of discussing educational theory and philosophy. Because of their focus on test preparation, county institutes in Santa Fe had fewer distinguished speakers, fewer discussion sections and fewer book studies than did similar institutes in other Southwestern states. Santa Fe institutes appear to have been unsuccessful in meeting the professional development vision set out by a nineteenth-century Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction, Manuel C. de Baca. “The great object of institutes”, Superintendent de Baca explained, “is to instruct teachers in the philosophy of their profession”.⁴⁸² To meet such a goal, institutes had to be separated from examination preparation.

In a territory with a generally disorganized education system, organizing and enforcing in-service opportunities for practicing teachers was a challenge. Without

⁴⁸⁰ “Second Annual Session . . . at the City of Las Vegas, N.M.”, cover.

⁴⁸¹ “Teachers’ Institute Notes”, *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 17, 1909.

⁴⁸² *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1898*, 9.

official laws to enforce penalties upon those teachers who failed to attend county institutes, territorial superintendents found difficult the encouragement of teacher attendance. The New Mexico story illustrates a case in which legal mandates involving penalties for non-attendance appeared to be necessary to ensure teacher involvement in institute work. Mandates were important, since, in the struggling New Mexican school system, stable educational organizations—like normal schools, teacher associations and teachers’ institutes—took on increased importance.⁴⁸³ Institutes provided an outlet for consistent interaction with other educators on the local, territorial and national fronts. They were a vehicle for reliable communication, both in terms of innovative educational thought and proscriptive official announcements. As the twentieth-century progressed, New Mexican administrators became increasingly aware of the importance that professional development meetings played in the improvement of the teaching population. In 1919, for example, State Superintendent of Public Instruction Jonathan H. Wagner (1917-1920) asked county superintendents to give preferential treatment to those teachers interested in professional development, as “special courses, teachers’ meetings, teachers’ institutes, state and national meetings and summer schools are necessary agencies for increasing the efficiency of teachers in service”.⁴⁸⁴

Despite New Mexican administrators’ acknowledged importance of professional development and their attempt at creating a centralized institute system, New Mexican institutes seemed to be of distinctly lower quality than those in other

⁴⁸³ Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, 17.

⁴⁸⁴ “Improvement In Service”, *Educational News Bulletin*, 3.5 (1917), 3.

Southwestern cities. Certainly, the county institute's single-track focus on teacher certification examination played a role in the mediocrity of their development. New Mexico's lack of a reliable transportation infrastructure and widely dispersed population also played a part in the territory's weak institute system. Still, the Territory of Arizona, despite encountering many of the same obstacles, managed to gain control of institute affairs and create a viable system of professional development for practicing teachers.

CHAPTER 6:

THE JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTE

IN PHOENIX, ARIZONA

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, Arizona politicians strove to organize a territory that would eventually be deemed worthy of joining the United States. Because of their push towards statehood, public education in Arizona tended to reflect existing systems in other states. A successful school system was a successful step towards statehood. Pennsylvania state legislator, Colonel Willis H Hulings, addressed Arizona's educational progress towards statehood at one 1894 joint county institute. "The people of Arizona," he praised, "whose star is soon to blaze in that beautiful flag of ours, are building upon a firm foundation, making permanent guarantees of her fitness to join the sisterhood of commonwealths".⁴⁸⁵

The Territorial Board of Education established the Arizona system of free public schools in 1871. The territorial superintendent presided over county superintendents. Urban areas like Phoenix and Tuscon, also had city superintendents of education. Funds to support public schools came from a system of territorial, county and district school taxes.⁴⁸⁶ Like other areas of the Southwest, the Arizona

⁴⁸⁵ "Educational: The Third Day of the Institute", *The Arizona Republican*, December 20, 1894.

⁴⁸⁶ Alleen Pace Nilsen, Margaret Ferry and L. J. Evans, *Dust in Our Desks: Territory Days of the Present in Arizona Schools* (Tempe: ASU Centennial Commission and College of Education Dean Robert T. Stout, 1985), 6.

territory needed many qualified teachers in order to address the needs of a growing, albeit slowly increasing, scholastic population. In 1872, the year following the establishment of public schools in the Arizona Territory, Governor Anson P.K. Safford (1869-1877) sent an urgent appeal to school districts across the United States that asked teachers to relocate to Arizona.⁴⁸⁷ Teachers in neighboring states and territories responded to Safford's call. Indeed, when Arizona achieved statehood on February 14, 1912, its public school system was well-organized and stable financially. School attendance, however, was low during the Progressive Era. Although a compulsory education law was put into place in when the Arizona system was established, the law was weakly enforced and generally ignored.

In 1880, the territory of Arizona had a population of 40,440, with the majority of the population centered in Maricopa County (Phoenix) and Pima County (Tuscon).⁴⁸⁸ Maricopa County, the largest of these two counties, housed more than a quarter of the territory's scholastic population and nearly half of the proprietary wealth of educational buildings.⁴⁸⁹ The high school in Phoenix, for example, was the largest and most modern PreK-12 educational building in Arizona.⁴⁹⁰

During the Progressive Era, the African-American population in Phoenix was small. In 1880, for example, only 155 African-Americans lived in the entire territory

⁴⁸⁷ Pamela Claire Hronek, "Women and Normal Schools: Tempe Normal, A Case Study, 1885-1925" (PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 1985), 72.

⁴⁸⁸ Dorothy Prater Niemi, "An Historical Survey of Public Education in Arizona, 1863-1994" (PhD dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1995), 31.

⁴⁸⁹ Niemi, "An Historical Survey of Public Education in Arizona, 1863-1994", 59.

⁴⁹⁰ "News and Notes from Arizona: Maricopa County" *The Arizona Journal of Education*, 1.4 (1910), 115.

of Arizona.⁴⁹¹ The number of school-aged children was considerably fewer. From the establishment of Arizona's public school system until 1909, African-American children in Phoenix attended schools with Anglo and Mexican-American children in a period of "relative racial concord".⁴⁹² Significantly, joint county institutes during this time featured no lectures on the education of African-American children. Although Phoenix officials instituted racial segregation at the local elementary schools in 1909 separate teacher institutes were not held for the system's African-American teachers. Presumably, although unclear from evidence, either Anglo teachers instructed African-American students during the ten-year span following segregation, or, the counties did not offer opportunities for professional development for African-American teachers.

In the early-twentieth century, over half of the school-aged children in the territory of Arizona were Mexican-American.⁴⁹³ Legally, the Arizona government never mandated the segregation of Spanish-speaking children, although, in 1939, the state's Office of Public Instruction that suggested separate classes be held for Mexican-American primary students. In practice, however, Mexican-American students were segregated into the barrios of South Phoenix.⁴⁹⁴ Latino educators were not involved in Phoenix public school administration during the late-nineteenth and

⁴⁹¹ Keith Jerome Crudup, "African Americans in Arizona: A Twentieth Century History" (PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 1998), 232.

⁴⁹² Crudup, "African Americans in Arizona", 256.

⁴⁹³ Herman Robert Lucero, "Plessy to Brown: the Education of Mexican Americans in Arizona Public Schools During the Era of Segregation", PhD dissertation, The University of Arizona, 2004, 57.

⁴⁹⁴ Bradford Luckingham, *Minorities in Phoenix: A Profile of Mexican American, Chinese American and African American Communities, 1860-1992* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1994), 50

early-twentieth centuries, although there were a few Mexican-American teachers working in Phoenix by the 1950's.⁴⁹⁵

The Maricopa County teacher institutes were the largest and best attended institutes in the state.⁴⁹⁶ Much of the reason for the size of the institute was a result of the relatively high population of the Phoenix area. The city's population grew quickly and steadily during the first part of the twentieth-century, ballooning from 5,544 in 1900 to 29,053 in 1920. The institutes also gained a boost in attendance because of their close associations with both the Arizona Teachers' Association and the Territorial/State Fair. In fact, teachers from outside of the area often traveled to Phoenix in order to attend the Maricopa joint county institutes.

TYPES OF INSTITUTES IN PHOENIX

Maricopa County teachers were fortunate to be in close proximity to the Tempe Normal school, founded in 1885. Importantly, any individual who promised to take a position within the territory of Arizona could attend Tempe Normal free of charge.⁴⁹⁷ These two factors—proximity and free tuition—resulted in higher teaching qualifications in the Phoenix area than in other parts of territory.⁴⁹⁸ Students who lived in Phoenix could drive a horse-drawn buggy back to and from campus each day, paying only the cost of books and materials.⁴⁹⁹ Maricopa County teachers, consequently, likely entered the profession with a strong pre-service

⁴⁹⁵ Luckingham, *Minorities in Phoenix*, 51.

⁴⁹⁶ See, for example, *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory of Arizona for the Years Ending June 30, 1905, and June 30, 1906*. (Phoenix: The H.H. McNeil Company, 1906), 19.

⁴⁹⁷ Hronek, "Women and Normal Schools", 94.

⁴⁹⁸ Maricopa County had the greatest percentage of students at Tempe Normal School. Hronek, 109.

⁴⁹⁹ Hronek, "Women and Normal Schools", 107.

background. In fact, the overall percentage of Arizona teachers entering the profession with a university or normal certificate was higher than that of the United States national average.⁵⁰⁰

Perhaps because of the increased opportunities afforded for education because of this unusual normal school situation, Maricopa County teachers generally did not attend multiple forms of teacher institutes. City institutes were uncommon in the territory of Arizona as a whole, likely due to the fact that the territory initially had county districts only—no municipal or metropolitan districts.⁵⁰¹ Although Phoenix teachers, residing in one of the only urban areas in the Territory of Arizona to hold city institutes, attended local meetings, the entire teaching population did not meet together at the same time. Instead, monthly institutes were arranged by grade level.⁵⁰² Unlike institutes in Houston, Texas, for example, Phoenix city institutes did not involve home study by teachers and did not feature speakers from outside the immediate local area.

Neither did Arizona, as did Colorado, have a system of summer normal institutes. By 1911, the Flagstaff Normal School, which opened in 1899, did offer summer coursework for “teachers already in service to do some work to brush up in

⁵⁰⁰ From 1906-1908, for example, half of all teachers applying for certificates had a university or normal degree. The Arizona Board of Education attributed this both to the accessibility of normal schools in the territory, and to the high salary paid to teachers in order to attract qualified teachers to work in the territory.

⁵⁰¹ “Resolutions Adopted by Arizona Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 19, 1906.

⁵⁰² For example, during the 1911-1912 school year, 1st and 2nd grade met on the first Monday of the month at 3:30 pm, 3rd and 4th grades met the first Tuesday of each month at 4:00 pm, 5th and 6th grades met the first Wednesday of each month at 4:00 pm and 7th and 8th grades met the first Thursday of each school month at 4:00 pm. From *The Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools for Maricopa County, Arizona Territory, for the year Ending June 30, 1912*. Arizona State Library, Maricopa County School Superintendent School Records, Film File 6.21.

subjects that they do not teach regularly”.⁵⁰³ Flagstaff professors advertised their summer courses at meetings of the Territorial Teachers Association and the Maricopa joint county institute.⁵⁰⁴ These Flagstaff summer courses, however, required payment of tuition, materials, room and board, but few Arizona teachers had extra funds for this sort of professional development.⁵⁰⁵ Without a system of state-sponsored summer normals, the annual county institutes became the focus of teacher professional development for most of the territory’s teaching corps.

County institutes were the most frequently held type of teacher’s institute, in many cases, the only type of professional development institute available to an Arizona teacher. The county institutes, in essence, became an amalgamation of a city, county and summer institute. They were held each year in nearly all counties except those that were “sparsely settled making it too difficult and expensive for the teachers to attend”.⁵⁰⁶ Teachers in distant counties were at least 100 miles from the nearest county seat; in one case, individual schools were more than 250 miles away from the county seat.⁵⁰⁷ County institutes in Arizona required thoughtful organization. They lasted three to five days and often featured prominent lecturers from around the United States, social events, evening entertainment, discussion sections, and demonstration lessons. In order to “procure the proper class of instructors and entertainers” necessary for a successful county institute, the State

⁵⁰³ “Flagstaff Normal and Summer Schools”, *The Arizona Journal of Education*, v2.2 (1911), 98.

⁵⁰⁴ “The Leading Teachers of the Territory,” *The Arizona Republican*, November 12, 1907.

⁵⁰⁵ “Flagstaff Normal”, 100.

⁵⁰⁶ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1906*, 9. In 1900, for example, there were four counties that did not hold a county teacher’s institute.

⁵⁰⁷ *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory of Arizona for the Years Ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900*. (Phoenix: The H. H. M’Neil Company Printers, 1900), 23.

Superintendent of Public Instruction encouraged Arizona counties to combine their resources.⁵⁰⁸ Many counties complied, holding “joint county institutes” involving teachers from several different Arizona counties.

The Maricopa joint county institute, sometimes called the Inter-County institute, was the largest of its kind in Arizona. It officially involved from three to eleven different counties, most often including nearby Pima and Yuma Counties. The institute most often met in Phoenix, usually at the high school building. On several occasions, however, the joint county institute met on the Tempe Normal School campus. This site was notable in as much as institute attendees had access to normal school facilities, including musical instruments, books, and demonstration classrooms. These institutes were held annually except in 1918 because of a nationwide influenza epidemic.⁵⁰⁹

At the 1892 meeting of the Maricopa joint county institute, educators and administrators formed the Teachers’ Association of Arizona. The group’s annual meeting was held in conjunction with the Maricopa institute from its establishment until 1910.⁵¹⁰ This territorial association likely would not have survived without the

⁵⁰⁸ *Seventh Biennial Report of The State Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of the State of Arizona for the Period July 1, 1922 to June 30, 1924*. (Phoenix: Manufacturing Stationers, 1924), 23.

⁵⁰⁹ “Schools Will Close Today as Preventive of Epidemic”, *The Arizona Republican*, October 7, 1918.

⁵¹⁰ “Closing Session of Teachers Association”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 13, 1909. At this time, the Territorial Teacher’s Association moved their meetings back to their original schedule in late December, and the Maricopa joint county institute continued meeting with the Arizona Fair in mid-November. When the Association moved their meetings back to December, a different joint county institute (with teachers from the southeastern portion of Arizona) joined the collaboration.

support of Maricopa County teachers.⁵¹¹ Excepting the first few years, the programs of the two organizations were kept separate; the meetings occurred on different days at the same location.⁵¹² When the two organizations eventually began to convene at separate times and sites, the Territorial Association provided Phoenix teachers with an additional opportunity for professional development. The well-attended meeting, dubbed “one of the most influential educational bodies in the Southwest”, attracted teachers from across Arizona.⁵¹³ In fact, it was known as the “Territorial Teachers’ Institute”, or the “Territorial Teachers’ Convention”, or the “Annual Teachers’ Conclave”. Visiting lecturers from across the nation came to speak at Teachers’ Association meetings. In 1910, for example, Charles A. McMurry from the Northern Illinois Normal School delivered seven different lectures over the course of the annual meeting.⁵¹⁴ In so much as the annual meeting involved many educators from areas of Arizona, it certainly must be considered a form of free professional development for practicing teachers.

ARIZONA LAWS GOVERNING INSTITUTE WORK

Although the Arizona public schools opened their doors in 1871, a formal institute system was not supported until twelve years later. The School Law of 1883 provided for an annual institute at the discretion of the county superintendent. If a

⁵¹¹ Donaldson, Marion Gray, “An Appraisal of the Arizona Education Association and Its Contribution to the Improvement of Public Education in Arizona”, PhD dissertation, University of Arizona, 1959, 37.

⁵¹² “The State Teacher’s Association”, *The Arizona Journal of Education* 2.4 (1911), 151.

⁵¹³ “Bisbee Teachers to Attend Association”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 5, 1911.

⁵¹⁴ “Program of the Nineteenth Annual Meeting of the Arizona Teachers’ Association and Joint County Institute”, *The Arizona Journal of Education*, 1.4 (1910), 120-123.

county superintendent elected to hold a county institute, it was to be between three to five days in length and all teachers in the county were required to attend.⁵¹⁵ For several years, no county superintendent chose to hold an institute. “In all of the counties the districts are scattered”, the Superintendent of Public Instruction explained in 1884, “and many of them are distant from the county seat. The fatigue and expense incurred in attending an institute as yet would be a hardship for many teachers”.⁵¹⁶ Four years later, the territorial legislature mandated teacher attendance.⁵¹⁷

With attendance at county institutes a legal requirement, teacher remuneration became an issue. Policymakers generally agreed that teachers should receive normal salary for days that they engaged institute work. Consequently, the Arizona School Law of 1885 mandated teacher compensation, provided that the county institute was held during the normal school year.⁵¹⁸ Travel expenses continued to be a contentious matter. Although some administrators held that teachers should receive full reimbursement for all receipts collected during travel to the institute, others believed that discounted rail fare for attendees (at 1/3rd the normal cost) was more than fair (or enough “compensations”). The issue was not resolved until the twenty-first territorial legislature in 1901:

⁵¹⁵ Alfred Thomas, *Public Education in Territorial Arizona 1864-1912* (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State College, 1952), 172.

⁵¹⁶ *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction* (Phoenix: The Office of Public Instruction, 1884), 201.

⁵¹⁷ Stephen B. Weeks, *Public Education in Arizona: Bulletin No. 17 of the Department of the Interior Bureau of Education* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918), 212.

⁵¹⁸ Weeks, *Public Education in Arizona*, 226.

Each teacher in attendance shall be allowed mileage at the rate of ten cents a mile, one way, from his or her school to the institute, to be computed by the most direct line, and shall be paid out of the institute fund, after paying the other expenses of the institute. If there is not enough money in such fund to pay such mileage, then said money shall be pro-rated among the teachers in attendance.⁵¹⁹

FINANCING THE INSTITUTES

The Territory of Arizona funded the county institute system through several different means. Initially, superintendents paid for institute expenses from unapportioned county school funds. When this amount became insufficient to fund programming, the Territorial Board of Education began to appropriate one-half percent of state school money to each district for direct deposit into a County Institute fund. At the request of individual superintendents, the Territorial Board supported institutes with additional lump sum donations at the request of individual superintendents.⁵²⁰ The county examination board also levied fees from teachers who took certification examination. Each applicant for a county examination paid an additional \$2.00 that went directly to the County Treasurer for deposit in the institute fund.

Initially, Arizona school law limited yearly institute expenditure to \$25.00 per year.⁵²¹ When several counties combined resources in order to hold a joint county institute, the amount increased to \$25.00 for each participating county. At the turn of the twentieth century, this amount reasonably could cover the minimal

⁵¹⁹ *Public School Legislation Enacted by the Twenty-First Territorial Legislature*, 1901 (Phoenix: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1901), 425.

⁵²⁰ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Arizona for the Year Ending June 30th, 1912* (Phoenix: Republican Print Shop, 1912), 7.

⁵²¹ *School Law of Arizona Territory*. (Phoenix: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1885), 226.

cost of a county institute, especially in the case of county collaboration. For example, expenses for a 1901 joint county institute composed of Maricopa Yavapai, Pima and Coconino counties totaled \$27.15:

Thompson Brothers, 500 booklets programme . . . \$15.00
B&B Company, 1 ¼ bolts ribbon . . . \$3.15
Prescott Courier badges . . . \$2.50
Prescott Courier Certificates of Attendance . . . \$1.50
Postage and Stationary . . . \$5.00⁵²²

Presumably, any unused monies were divided among the participating counties and returned to their institute funds. Yet the *Arizona Teacher*, one of the territory's educational periodicals, published an editorial that suggested that this division did not always happen. One 1915 *Arizona Teacher* editorial mentions an anonymous county superintendent "who last year delivered all the lectures himself and pocketed the money which the State appropriates for teachers' institutes".⁵²³

As inflation increased during the first part of the twentieth-century, \$25.00 per county could no longer sustain the yearly institute, certainly not if superintendents brought visiting lecturers to these meetings from outside the immediate area. In 1912, for example, estimated Maricopa County institute expenses reached as high as \$600.00.⁵²⁴ In the twentieth century, county superintendents were granted the legal right to draw upon the entire balance of the teachers' institute fund, "provided, that such amount drawn does not exceed the

⁵²² H.H. Fulton, W.W. McNeff, and F. Yale Adams, *Minutes of the 10th Annual Arizona Teachers Association in Conjunction with The Joint County Institute of Maricopa, Yavapai, Pima and Coconino Counties. Held at Prescott, Arizona, December 23-27, 1901*, Hayden Arizona Collection, CE EPH E-145, Arizona State University Library.

⁵²³ "Editorial Comment: The Institute", *Arizona Teacher*, 4.3 (1915), 6.

⁵²⁴ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Arizona for the Year Ending June 30th, 1912* (Phoenix: Republican Print Shop, 1912), 7.

amount of the teachers' institute fund in the hands of the county treasurer".⁵²⁵ Depletion of the entire fund was rarely an issue, especially in the case of joint county institutes, which combined treasuries to meet meeting expenses. In Maricopa County, for example, the superintendent generally did not use the entire institute fund each year.⁵²⁶

MARICOPA JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTES AND THE ARIZONA TERRITORIAL FAIR

County superintendents could choose to hold their institutes at any time during the school year. Initially, Maricopa joint county institutes were held in mid-December. When students were sent home for the holidays, teachers remained in town such that they might engage in professional development work. The problem with this timing was that Tempe Normal School professors were in the midst of exams during mid-December. Consequently, they could not easily leave their classes to lecture at the Maricopa County institute.⁵²⁷ Subsequently, the institute was pushed near to the end of December. In fact, it often occurred near December 25th. In 1895, for example, the county institute opened on December 24th and closed on December 28th—with teachers having only Christmas Day off for their winter holidays.⁵²⁸

In 1905, Arizona citizens revived the Territorial Fair, a celebration that had been dissolved in 1891 because of flooding of the fairgrounds. Dates for the

⁵²⁵ *Public School Legislation* 1901, 425.

⁵²⁶ See, for example, *Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools for Maricopa County, Arizona Territory* (Phoenix: The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction) for the years from 1905-1915.

⁵²⁷ "Normal School Professors and Pupils (County News)", *The Arizona Republican*, December 18, 1890.

⁵²⁸ "Fourth Days Institute", *The Arizona Republican*, December 26, 1895.

Territorial Fair corresponded with the Maricopa joint county institute. Indeed, the first day of the fair was also the first day of the teachers' meeting. This accidental pairing proved fortuitous. Teachers received a surprise half-day holiday from the institute. The institute adjourned at noon in order that teachers could visit the nearby fairgrounds.⁵²⁹ While at the fair, teachers participated in the Educational Exhibit, a display of school related materials from across the nation. Phoenix teachers routinely participated in this exhibition. They highlighted Geography and Science work undertaken at the high school and displayed information on manual training in the city schools.⁵³⁰

The following year, 1906, the date of the territorial fair was moved to mid-November. The Maricopa County superintendent followed this action by changing the dates of the institute to correspond with those of the fair. During November, students were dismissed from school. This action had the dual benefit of allowing students to attend the Territorial Fair and providing teachers with the time to attend a week of institute sessions. Because of this week-long holiday, Phoenix area students received a shortened vacation during the winter holidays—one week off instead of the two weeks that students in other areas enjoyed.⁵³¹ If they were not tardy or absent without good cause, teachers continued to receive a full salary during the institute week.⁵³²

⁵²⁹ "County Teachers Had Half Holiday", *The Arizona Republican*, December 28, 1905.

⁵³⁰ "The Territorial Fair", *The Arizona Republican*, December 26, 1905.

⁵³¹ "Weeks' Vacation for Tempe Students Owing to the Presence of Teachers at the County Institute", *The Arizona Republican*, November 7, 1910.

⁵³² *Maricopa County School Report*, 1912, p. 14; *Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arizona Territorial Teachers Association Held at Phoenix, Arizona, December 19th to 23rd 1892 Inclusive*, Hayden Library Arizona Collection, E-128.

Also in 1906, visiting teachers from across the territory came to Phoenix in order to attend the joint county institute and the Teachers' Association meeting. The nearby Territorial Fair attracted teachers who would not otherwise have come to meetings in the Phoenix area.⁵³³ Indeed, so many visiting teachers were in town that the Maricopa county superintendent had to make special arrangements in order to secure enough rooms and apartments to house the visiting teachers.⁵³⁴ Institute and Association meeting attendees received special badges in order that Arizona citizens who attended the fair readily would recognize them as teachers.⁵³⁵ In addition to their contributions to the educational display on the fairgrounds, teachers created an additional exhibition at the Central School Building in Phoenix, the site of the Maricopa joint county institute. Although the free display was designed such that visiting fairgoers could see positive work taking place in the Phoenix area schools, it was also open to the local community:

Not only the visitors in the city and the teachers, but all the parents and school patrons are invited to visit the Central building and inspect the work of the pupils. It will be open every day, each room under the charge of a proper person, so the Central school building will really be an auxiliary to the educational display at the fair grounds. It is a good opportunity for Phoenix parents to see what their children are doing in school.⁵³⁶

The Territorial Fair remained an important part of the Maricopa joint county institute for many years. Policymakers used the fair as a motivational tool to inspire local teachers. Institute speakers sprinkled their lectures with references to the fair. For example, C. O. Case, Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction, told institute

⁵³³ "Teachers In Phoenix," *The Arizona Republican*, November 8, 1911.

⁵³⁴ "Cause of Education Well Looked After", *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1906.

⁵³⁵ "Cause of Education", 1906.

⁵³⁶ "Cause of Education", 1906.

attendees in 1913, “It is ‘fair time’ now and may we not in keeping with the spirit of the fair, be thinking of the prizes we might win in our work in education”.⁵³⁷ Sometimes, individuals devoted entire lectures to work with the fair. For example, the superintendent of the educational department at the fair presented a speech to institute attendees entitled, “What We Are Doing at the State Fair for Education”.⁵³⁸ School administrators thought that teachers, through their institute work with the fair, would make “close inspection of this splendid exhibit” and return to their job with renewed “determination to raise the standard of school work”.⁵³⁹

As part of a reciprocal relationship, the Maricopa joint county institute also returned much back to the fair. Teachers were instrumental in securing a special building for the educational exhibit. When the exhibit eventually became too large to fit in the crowded main fair building, the Maricopa joint county institute lobbied for a separate space to house their work.⁵⁴⁰ Notably, fairgoers from across the nation became aware of Arizona schools because of the hard work of institute teachers:

One lady from a large Eastern city said frankly that it was all revelation to her—she had not dreamed that away out in the desert (as her pre-conceived idea of the country had been) she would find school children of all ages preparing a display of work which she generously admitted was better than her home city had every shown.⁵⁴¹

⁵³⁷ “Superintendent Case’s Speech to Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 7, 1913.

⁵³⁸ “The State Teachers’ Association” *The Arizona Journal of Education*, 2.4 (1911), 151.

⁵³⁹ “Seventh Annual Arizona Fair”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.2 (1911), 108.

⁵⁴⁰ “Teachers Want New Building for Exhibit”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 13, 1914.

⁵⁴¹ “Education in Arizona: School Exhibit Opens the Eyes of Visitors”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 10, 1911.

THE CONTENT AND STRUCTURE OF THE MARICOPA JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTE

County superintendents were free to choose the curriculum for their county institutes developed under their supervision. The Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction did not publish a required course of study for professional development meetings. Rather, the Office of the Superintendent offered only broad suggestions with reference to content. For example, F. J. Netherton, Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction in 1893, recommended that “methods of instruction, school economy, government and all the various questions, familiarity with which materially conduces to the teacher’s success, should be systematically studied and discussed”.⁵⁴² The generality of this suggestion meant, of course, that the content of institutes could vary greatly from county to county.

For the most part, Maricopa joint county institutes followed lectures on specific topics. Individuals addressed the entire group of county teachers at one or more times with short breaks for music interludes and fifteen minute recesses. Sometimes, the institute had a general theme. The 1914 joint county institute, for example focused on “Appreciation”—that is, “Appreciation in General, Appreciation of Music, Appreciation of Art”.⁵⁴³ More often, the institute was not themed. Rather, speakers lectured on a wide-variety of topics—some inspirational (e.g., “The Teacher, the Hope of the Republic”⁵⁴⁴), some humorous (e.g., “Gumption with a Big G”), others moral (e.g., “The Influence of the Teachers’ Character”)⁵⁴⁵, political

⁵⁴² *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory of Arizona for 1893* (Phoenix: Office of Public Instruction, 1893), 367.

⁵⁴³ J.A. Riggins, “Maricopa County Notes”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.2 (1914), 38.

⁵⁴⁴ *Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arizona Territorial Teacher 1892*

⁵⁴⁵ “Joint County Institute”, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1900*, 25.

(e.g., “Free Text Books in the High School”)⁵⁴⁶, subject specific (e.g., “How to Teach Language in the District School”)⁵⁴⁷, and general (e.g., “School Management”).⁵⁴⁸ Programs of Maricopa County institutes offered somewhat equivalent emphasis on improvement of practice and on theory.

A.H. Fulton, Maricopa County Superintendent at the turn of the twentieth century, disapproved of the lecture plan for institute work. When he assumed the Maricopa county superintendency in 1899, he began to break the institute apart into multiple discussion sections. “True”, Fulton acknowledged, “The workers do the most of the work, but dozens are at work, not merely listening to one, two, or three persons lecture”.⁵⁴⁹ He did not eliminate lectures, but he divided teachers into different sections for afternoon work during at least one day of the institute, usually Primary, Grammar and Advanced sections. The Primary section sometimes divided even further into separate grade-level groups (first grade, second grade, etc).⁵⁵⁰ In these breakout sessions, teachers taught model lessons and gave content-specific pedagogical suggestions. If teachers in one of the sections finished early, they would adjourn to another section of their choice in order to finish out the institute day.⁵⁵¹

Early Maricopa County institutes contained several specifically religious elements. They opened each morning with a prayer and invocation. Choirs from local Christian churches entertained the teachers, speakers peppered their lectures

⁵⁴⁶ “Joint County Institute”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.4 (1914), 28.

⁵⁴⁷ “The Second Day: Real Work in the Institute Begins”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 21, 1892.

⁵⁴⁸ *Minutes of the 10th Annual Arizona Teachers Association 1901*.

⁵⁴⁹ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of 1909*, 19.

⁵⁵⁰ “Geography’s Place: Too Much of it in the Grammar Grades”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 30, 1904.

⁵⁵¹ “Third Day’s Work”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 24, 1903.

with religious metaphors, and teachers sang hymns like “Blest Be the Tie that Binds” and “Nearer my God to Thee.”⁵⁵² Sometimes, even, local clergy presented lectures. In 1898, for example, Baptist preacher Lewis Halsey delivered the opening address of the institute.⁵⁵³ As institutes progressed into the twentieth century, opening day activities of the annual institute still occasionally featured opening prayers and invocations. However, religious elements of the institute became less overt. Substituting for the overtly religious trappings, Maricopa institutes began more frequently to open with secular sessions that featured piano solos and welcome addresses. One explanation for this shift in emphasis reasonably may have been the change in the time of year when the institute was held—that is, the move from the immediate Christmas season to mid-November. Another possibility may have been the perspective of Maricopa County Superintendent A.H. Fulton, who stressed the separation of church and state. “The law as it stands regarding religious training in public schools of the territory is wise”, Fulton said at a 1907 institute session, “for there are many fanatics who do not realize that they are fanatics”.⁵⁵⁴

The joint county institute attracted lecturers from school districts, normal schools, universities and government agencies across the United States. Visiting speakers routinely came to Phoenix from cities such as Terre Haute, Indiana, Lansing, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, Saratoga Springs, New York, and San Diego,

⁵⁵² “Educational Experts”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 31, 1896.

⁵⁵³ “Teachers Assemble”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 27, 1898.

⁵⁵⁴ “The Themes of Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 14, 1907.

California.⁵⁵⁵ Among some of the most notable individuals who addressed teachers at the Maricopa Joint County Institute were: Starr Jordan, President of Stanford University,⁵⁵⁶ William H. Mace, textbook author and Professor of History of Syracuse University,⁵⁵⁷ Professor Harold W. Foght of the U.S. Bureau of Education,⁵⁵⁸ and Washington, D.C., plant ecologist, William Cannon, employed by the Desert Laboratory of the Carnegie Institute.⁵⁵⁹ In 1903, the institute was visited by an individual from outside of the continental United States. This practitioner, Lillian White, a visiting teacher from the Philippines, spoke to a general session about conflicts between native teachers and American teachers in that U.S. territory.⁵⁶⁰ Visiting lecturers, often referred to as “institute instructors”, ordinarily presented more than one address, sometimes at general sessions and, on other occasions, at grade-level sectional meetings.

In addition to lectures and breakout sections, teachers sometimes spent the institute afternoon hours on local field trips. Teachers sometimes toured Phoenix public school classrooms to observe physical facilities and instructional materials. These classrooms, of course, would be empty of students, since schools were closed during institute week. Because the railroad offered discounted rates for teachers, institute attendees sometimes visited the nearby normal school in Tempe, the

⁵⁵⁵ “Teachers Institute is Well Attended”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1909; “Teachers in Conference”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 7, 1911; “Joint County Teachers Meet”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 5, 1913; “Second Day of the Institute”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1914.

⁵⁵⁶ “The Teachers’ Fight Against Superintendent Long”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1908.

⁵⁵⁷ “Maricopa County”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.3 (1914), 36.

⁵⁵⁸ “Maricopa”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 6.4 (1916), 29.

⁵⁵⁹ “The Themes of Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 14, 1907.

⁵⁶⁰ “Third Day’s Work”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 24, 1903.

Territorial Normal School of Arizona.⁵⁶¹ Teachers also traveled, on occasion, to the San Xavier Mission and the Salt River Valley.⁵⁶² Commonly, attendees participated in only one field trip per annual institute.

Political discussions sometimes took center stage at Maricopa joint county institutes. Teachers debated issues like compulsory education, the move of the territory towards statehood, teacher salaries, and free textbooks. The 1907 institute featured a particularly controversial topic, one that prompted *The Arizona Republican* to feature a newspaper article with a sensationalized subhead about the day's institute session: "In its Closing Moments There Was an Exciting Incident".⁵⁶³ Institute attendees expressed frustration that Territorial Superintendent of Instruction Long failed to attend any of the joint county institute sessions that year. They drafted an incomplete resolution to the Arizona Governor that chastised him of harboring a negative attitude toward towards teacher organizations and of making "sarcastic and discouraging" replies in response to questions from teachers.⁵⁶⁴ Phoenix superintendent Stillwell in particular, led the fight to censure Territorial Superintendent Long.⁵⁶⁵ Because of the lively, sometimes vehement debate engendered by this resolution, the teachers tabled this resolution as unfinished business to be taken up the following year. At that 1908 meeting, the debate resumed and friends of Superintendent Long asked that all references to the censure

⁵⁶¹ "Visiting Teachers Saw Tempe Normal," *The Arizona Republican*, November 12, 1909.

⁵⁶² *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 1900, p 27; "Teachers' Excursion", *The Arizona Republican*, 1899.

⁵⁶³ "Last Day With Teachers, End of Annual Meeting of the Association", *The Arizona Republican*, November 16, 1907.

⁵⁶⁴ "Last Day," 1907.

⁵⁶⁵ "The Teachers' Fight Against Superintendent Long", *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1908.

be struck from the official record. The resolution was “argued vigorously and with considerable heat for an hour”.⁵⁶⁶ Superintendent Stillwell agreed to “let bygones be bygones” and the 1907 unfinished resolution eventually was expunged from the minutes. Only an article the territorial newspaper, *The Arizona Republican*, carried official documentation of the debate. As follow up action, however, the Territorial Teacher’s Association drafted an official resolution to the Governor that asked that the State Superintendent of Education be “required to visit annually the county institutes in the different counties”.⁵⁶⁷

Early Maricopa County institutes featured several sessions about the education of Mexican-American pupils. During these sessions, lecturers stressed the importance of teachers of these children having at least some knowledge of Spanish.⁵⁶⁸ In 1891, for example, Phoenix teacher Mary R. Spafford advocated that teachers learn the Spanish language as well as the correct pronunciation and spellings of student names. “I believe then, and only then”, she asserted, “that the sympathy and feeling of co-operating may exist between teacher and pupils, which is necessary to successful work.”⁵⁶⁹ Spafford also suggested the integration of Spanish songs and recitations into the curriculum. She additionally provided institute attendees with detailed suggestions as to how to begin English language instruction for Spanish speakers. After the turn of the twentieth-century, institute sessions that

⁵⁶⁶ “The Teachers Fight”, 1908.

⁵⁶⁷ John C. Bury, *The Historical Role of Arizona’s Superintendent of Public Instruction: Volume I* (Flagstaff: Northern Arizona University, 1974), 297.

⁵⁶⁸ “Teachers in Council: An Entertaining Day Had at the Institute”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 19, 1890.

⁵⁶⁹ “Teacher’s Institute” *The Arizona Republican*, December 20, 1891.

focused on Spanish-speaking children became rare. This change likely was a result of Title XIX, a piece of legislation passed by the Territorial Legislature in 1899, that mandated English-language instruction in the territorial schools of Arizona.⁵⁷⁰

Another feature of the Maricopa joint county institute, as well as of other teachers' institutes in the state, was the presence of textbook exhibitors. County superintendents routinely allowed publishing agents and advertisers to set up tables on which to display their materials. Publishers' representatives who were unable to attend the institute mailed materials and pamphlets to superintendents to arrange on tables at the institute. At the institute, teachers could purchase materials and place their names on publisher's mailing lists:

Many teachers were willing to say that they received as much real benefit from the exhibits and opportunities afforded them in looking over the newest publications and talking with the book men, as the derived from the lectures themselves.⁵⁷¹

Certainly, the institute was an important advertising venue for educational publishers. In addition to teachers, Territorial Normal School of Arizona professors, parents and school trustees also visited the booths. The publishers' tables became gathering points around which Phoenix citizens interested in education met to mix and mingle.

⁵⁷⁰ Vicki L. Ruiz, "South By Southwest: Mexican Americans and Segregated Schooling, 1900-1950", *OAH Magazine of History*, 15, 2001.

⁵⁷¹ "School News of the State: Maricopa", *The Arizona Teacher*, 4.4 (1915), 27.

SOCIALIZATION AT THE JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTE

The institute was an important means of socialization among practicing teachers. School administrators recognized this role of the institute and encouraged teachers to attend county institutes and “meet your friends, your fellow teachers. Don’t wait for introductions, mingle and mix”.⁵⁷² Some of this socialization occurred during regular institute sessions, especially during short recesses and the lunch break between morning and afternoon sessions. Unlike the decorum on which they insisted in their own classrooms, teachers sometimes socialized to the point of distraction. For example, teachers passed so many notes back-and-forth during one 1891 institute session that the Phoenix newspaper actually reported the activity in an article the next day.⁵⁷³

Evening sessions were the hub of the institute social world. These sessions, often the most popular part of the institute, sometimes were filled, with only standing room available to late-comers.⁵⁷⁴ They routinely began at 8:00 PM and generally featured a guest lecture on a general topic, like “The Test of True Teaching” or “Nature and the School as Instrument in Education.”⁵⁷⁵ The keynote speaker’s address was accompanied by musical interludes. Some years, the evening session had a reading or oration instead of a lecture, and the program was almost entirely

⁵⁷² “Editorial Comment: The County Institute”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.2 (1914), 7.

⁵⁷³ “They Say Goodbye: The Closing Day of the Teacher’s Institute”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 20, 1891.

⁵⁷⁴ “Teachers at Tucson”, *The Arizona Republican*, January 1, 1900.

⁵⁷⁵ “Teachers Hear Many Lectures”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 6, 1913; Fulton et al, 1901.

entertainment.⁵⁷⁶ The 1914 joint county institute program had a unusual performance; the closing session of the institute was a “musical carnival”—essentially, a talent revue. Attendees sang, played instruments and gave dramatic readings.⁵⁷⁷

For at least one night during the county institutes, a reception followed the evening session. On occasion, Phoenix organizations and clubs sponsored the receptions, which were sometimes held at a local hotel. The rooms in which the receptions were held featured lavish decorations, music, refreshments and sometimes dancing. At one 1906 reception, teachers received a souvenir rose at the close of the evening.⁵⁷⁸ Another year, the evening reception was held at Phoenix opera house.⁵⁷⁹ The Phoenix area paper, *The Arizona Republican*, reported on an evening reception in 1900 by saying, “all enjoyed themselves as only such a large jolly assemblage of school teachers could”.⁵⁸⁰ Importantly, however, not all Arizona citizens accepted the value of developing an *esprit de corps* through institute social events. In a 1915 editorial advocating the abolishment of county institutes, editors of *The Arizona Teacher* remarked, “We can’t for the world of us understand why a teachers’ institute should be turned into a vaudeville”.⁵⁸¹

⁵⁷⁶ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 1900, pp. 26-27; *Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arizona Territorial Teachers Association Held at Phoenix, Arizona, December 19th to 23rd Inclusive*, Hayden Library Arizona Collection, E-128.

⁵⁷⁷ “Teachers Want New Building For Exhibit,” *The Arizona Republican*, November 13, 1914.

⁵⁷⁸ “Teachers of Arizona in Annual Session,” *The Arizona Republican*, November 14, 1906.

⁵⁷⁹ “Directors of the Youth: Teachers of Arizona in Annual Session,” *The Arizona Republican*, December 29, 1896.

⁵⁸⁰ “An Evening Session,” *The Arizona Republican*, December 21, 1900.

⁵⁸¹ “Editorial Comment: Institutes,” *The Arizona Teacher*, 3.2 (1915), 8.

THE “INDIAN TEACHERS’ INSTITUTE”

During the Progressive Era until World War II, the Native American population in the Phoenix area was “quite small”.⁵⁸² White teachers, in fact, educated Native American children of Maricopa County at the Phoenix Indian School, under control of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Teachers at this school and other Indian schools in the Arizona Territory did not attend the territory-sponsored teacher institutes. Rather, they participated in a federally-sponsored “Indian Teachers Institute” which was established soon after the turn-of-the-century. This institute met over the winter holidays in Phoenix. Teachers from all Arizona Territory Indian schools, on order from the federal Bureau of Indian Affairs, attended the meeting.⁵⁸³ Lectures given at these institutes focused on ways to assimilate the Native American population into the dominant Anglo culture. One year, for example, University of Arizona President F. Yale Adams spoke to teachers on “Educating the Indian for Citizenship”, Major W. Crouse, a United States agent from Fort Apache, presented a paper entitled “Particular Training of Most Importance to the Indians”, and Mary Fenneli, teacher at the Fort Yuma Indian school, talked on “How Best to Elevate the Moral Nature of the Indian Child”.⁵⁸⁴

⁵⁸² Steve Amerman, “Making an Indian Place in Urban Schools: Native Americans and Education in Phoenix, 1941-1984” (PhD dissertation, Arizona State University, 2002), 15.

⁵⁸³ “Indian Institute and the Christmas Festivities at the Indian School”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 26, 1902.

⁵⁸⁴ “Indian Institute”, 1902.

CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE MARICOPA JOINT COUNTY INSTITUTES

Joint county institutes in Arizona differed from single county institutes in several ways. First, teachers had opportunities to interact with colleagues whom they may not have encountered otherwise. This interaction was particularly important for teachers in Arizona, as vast distances and sparsely populated areas resulted in fewer opportunities for socialization. Second, joint institutes enabled attendees to profit from enriched opportunities. Teachers listened to daily reports from superintendents of different counties and lectures about curriculum in other districts. They also collaborated with teachers from different parts of the territory. Also, superintendents at joint county institutes pooled their funding and were able to bring nationally prominent lecturers to their institutes.

This Arizona story is notable for its push towards increasingly centralized professional development of teachers. Rather than advocating local in-service meetings at the city or even county level, superintendents advocated joint county institutes and territory-wide meetings. That is, only through meetings that involved many different districts in Arizona could major educational problems be discussed and solutions advanced.⁵⁸⁵ The State Superintendent of Public Instruction explained that in larger meetings “professionalism can be promoted in a greater degree than can be secured in smaller units”.⁵⁸⁶

⁵⁸⁵ “Editorial Comment,” *The Arizona Teacher*, 5.4 (1916), 28.

⁵⁸⁶ *State Superintendent of Public Instruction*, 1922-1924, 23.

Arizona institutes were also significant because of their close partnerships with other organizations. In the case of the Maricopa joint county institutes, the Territorial Teacher's Association and the Territorial Fair were conspicuous allies. The association with both these organizations brought benefits to institutes for Phoenix teachers. As a result of joint meetings with the teachers' association, larger numbers of administrators and policymakers attended the institute than otherwise would have been expected. These partnerships probably increased general institute attendance. When the Maricopa joint county institute began to schedule meetings in conjunction with the territorial fair, notable guest speakers from across the county routinely participated in the institute schedule. Making two presentations on one trip (at the joint county institute and the teachers' association meeting) while also attending a territorial fair, attracted many lecturers to the Phoenix area.

Phoenix administrators and policymakers believed that teachers had a need for professional training. This conviction manifested itself through the teachers' institute. Importantly, the same sort of teachers' institute was not appropriate in all places and in all situations. Phoenix institutes exhibited unique conditions appropriate to the region; two distinctive characteristics, for example, were the institute's relationship to the territorial fair and the marked opportunities for social interactions among practicing teachers. Still, professional development in Phoenix was not altogether different from other cities in the American Southwest. Indeed, the Maricopa County story can help illustrate themes related to the four other cities in this study. The following chapter discusses some of these conclusions and explains

the character of teachers' institutes in Houston, Texas, San Antonio, Texas, Denver, Colorado, Santa Fe, New Mexico and Phoenix, Arizona.

CHAPTER 7:

CONCLUSIONS

The important roles that major Southwestern cities played in the history of the region, as described by Historian Bradford Luckingham, are “centers of life in a land of wide open spaces”.⁵⁸⁷ All five cities in this study—Phoenix, Santa Fe, Denver, Houston and San Antonio—are metropolitan areas with considerable prospects for the professional development of educators. Inasmuch as “urban developers worked to reproduce familiar city patterns in the new country”,⁵⁸⁸ teachers living in Southwestern cities also engaged in much of the same professional development opportunities as did their Northeastern counterparts. Importantly then, the relative geographic remoteness of the American Southwest generally did not restrict the professional development of teachers living in Phoenix, Santa Fe, Denver, Houston and San Antonio. In all five cities, teachers participated in at least one annually scheduled form of teachers’ institute.

The amount of time individual teachers spent at institutes differed greatly depending on their city of residence. Phoenix teachers had minimum, albeit intensive, requirements; they attended joint county institutes for one week each year. These teachers also attended city institutes that were scheduled on an infrequent

⁵⁸⁷ Bradford Luckingham, “The American Southwest: An Urban View”, *The Western Historical Quarterly*, 15.3: 279.

⁵⁸⁸ Luckingham, “The American Southwest”, 261.

basis. Of the five cities, San Antonio educators participated in more institutes than did teachers in the other four cities. During the city superintendency of Lloyd Wolfe, for example, San Antonio teachers attended city institutes, county institutes, summer normals, and the summer School of Methods. That meant that San Antonio teachers might attend as many as eleven weeks of institutes during the course of one school year.⁵⁸⁹ Certainly, these differences were and remain substantial—one week in Phoenix compared to eleven weeks in San Antonio. However, these examples are estimates only. If Phoenix teachers chose to attend the annual Teacher’s Association meetings and were teaching in a year in which frequent city institutes were held, they attended more professional development than usual. San Antonio teachers who did not teach under the administration of Wolfe and who did not choose to attend state-sponsored summer normals actually attended fewer institutes.

For the most part, this study supports a conclusion advanced by Sandra Johnson Potter in her 1980 study of in-service education in the Dakota Territories. Teachers living in geographically isolated parts of the United States enjoyed opportunities for quality professional development during the Progressive Era.⁵⁹⁰ However, the institute experience of Southwestern teachers modifies Potter’s findings in two ways. First, the length of this professional development was

⁵⁸⁹ Specifically, ten city institutes held one Saturday a month throughout the scholastic year (two weeks); a week-long county institute, a month-long School of Methods and an (optional) month-long summer normal.

⁵⁹⁰ Potter, “Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers”, 207.

dependent upon both time and place. Secondly, this conclusion seem to applicable only to teachers in urban areas.⁵⁹¹

In terms of institute content, a few similarities do generally appear across institute work in the Southwest. First, most institutes included some lectures on subject-specific material. Break-out sessions often contained at least two or three “how to teach” sessions during which an instructor presented suggested methods of instruction to a group of teachers. Many such sessions were geared towards a general subject area like “How to Teach Gardening”⁵⁹² or “How to Teach Language in the District School”.⁵⁹³ Classroom management was another frequent topic covered by these Southwestern teacher institutes. Some management lectures focused on classroom organization like “The Lesson—Assignment, Preparation and Recitation”⁵⁹⁴. Sometimes, institutes dealt with morality and ethics, both in general terms, like “The Importance of Moral Teaching in Our Public Schools” and in specificity, for example, a lengthy discussion on the issue of temperance to “drive the alcohol out of the territory”.⁵⁹⁵ Other sessions dealt with behavior management, like “Talk! Talk! Talk!” and “Idle Hands”.⁵⁹⁶ Most institutes also incorporated

⁵⁹¹ Take, for example, the remote Arizona county whose only teachers’ institute was cancelled due to the fact that several of the school districts were more than 250 miles from the county seat. See *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the Territory of Arizona for the Years Ending June 30, 1899, and June 30, 1900*. (Phoenix: The H. H. M’Neil Company Printers, 1900), 23.

⁵⁹² “Discussion about School Matters: Teachers’ Institute Has Interesting Program,” *San Antonio Daily Express*, November 12, 1903.

⁵⁹³ “The Second Day: Real Work in the Institute Begins,” *The Arizona Republican*, December 21, 1892.

⁵⁹⁴ “Many Teachers are Present at the County Institute and the Program is of Deep Interest to Those Who are in Attendance,” *San Antonio Daily Express*, October 11, 1906.

⁵⁹⁵ “Teachers’ Institute: An Occasion That Was Interesting and Instructive,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 5, 1899; “Teachers’ Institute Notes,” *Santa Fe New Mexican*, August 28, 1909.

⁵⁹⁶ Houston Independent School District. *Report 1890-1891*, 28.

motivational lectures that were designed to inspire teachers to improve their daily work. In order to “awaken professional pride and zeal”⁵⁹⁷ institutes offered, for example, sessions like “The Teacher, the Hope of the Republic”.⁵⁹⁸

Comprehensive studies of teachers’ institutes in other geographic regions during the same time period—namely, Louisiana, Pennsylvania, Virginia, the Dakotas, and Tennessee—have noted similar foci.⁵⁹⁹ To be sure, Southwestern teacher institutes also dealt with regionally specific issues like bilingual pedagogy and desert ecosystems.⁶⁰⁰ Furthermore, individual cities had areas of focus; namely, Santa Fe county institutes targeted subject matter, San Antonio and Houston city institutes focused on pedagogy and theory, whereas Maricopa County (Phoenix) institutes and Denver summer institutes had a diffused focus. Teachers’ institutes in the American Southwest typically followed national trends in their focus on content

DISSEMINATING IDEAS THROUGH INSTITUTE WORK: ACCESS VERSUS CONTROL

Institutes conveyed contemporary trends in educational theory and practice to Progressive Era teachers in the American Southwest. Teachers encountered ideas from other parts of the country both through their study of recently published books

⁵⁹⁷ First Report of the Northside Public Schools, District No 17, Denver and the Highlands (Denver: Arapahoe County Board of Directors, 1891), 42.

⁵⁹⁸ *Minutes of the First Meeting of the Arizona Territorial Teacher 1892*

⁵⁹⁹ See also a 1911 survey by William C. Ruediger, which confirms that these types of content were common to teachers’ institutes on a national scale. William C. Ruediger, *Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers In Service*, United States Bureau of Education Bulletin No. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913), 17.

⁶⁰⁰ Amado Chaves, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31st, 1896* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1896), 8-9; “The Themes of Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 14, 1907.

and through listening to visiting lecturers. In Houston, for example, local institutes engaged in book studies that targeted the understanding of fundamental educational principles as means of expressing and developing new knowledge.⁶⁰¹ As part of their institute work, Houston teachers read about and discussed issues highlighted in professional periodicals and popular national publications.⁶⁰² The Phoenix joint county institute, as did institutes in other cities, attracted lecturers from school districts, normal schools, universities and government agencies across the country; for example, Terre Haute, Indiana, Lansing, Michigan, Chicago, Illinois, Saratoga Spring, New York, San Diego, California and Washington D.C.⁶⁰³ The institutes constituted a major conduit through which knowledge about teaching and schooling could be diffused to Southwestern teachers. Through their work at institutes, teachers in the American Southwest had increased access to educational ideas.

Still, who controlled this access? Teachers typically were powerless. The State Board of Education in all of the states and territories in this study, except Arizona, published “courses of study” for use in teachers’ institutes. New Mexico, for example, published a uniform course of study for county institutes.⁶⁰⁴ This publication, however, essentially was a study guide for certification examinations held during the institute, and was not necessarily a prescription for institute

⁶⁰¹ Houston Independent School District, *Report*, 1911-1912, 20.

⁶⁰² Mindy Spearman, “Saturday Teacher Institutes in Houston Texas, from 1887-1916”, *The American Educational History Journal* 31.1 (2004), 66-71.

⁶⁰³ “Teachers Institute is Well Attended”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1909; “Teachers in Conference”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 7, 1911; “Joint County Teachers Meet”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 5, 1913; “Second Day of the Institute”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 11, 1914, “The Themes of Teachers”, *The Arizona Republican*, November 14, 1907.

⁶⁰⁴ Placido Sandoval, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction for the Year Ending December 31, 1897*. (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1898), 7.

content.⁶⁰⁵ The Texas State Department of Education, also, published guidelines for county institute work.⁶⁰⁶ Unlike New Mexico, Texas State Superintendents enforced their guidelines by insisting that each county submit institute programs to the Department for pre-approval.⁶⁰⁷ However, superintendents like Lloyd Wolfe encouraged their teachers to neglect proceedings regulated by the government and, instead, to attend other forms of institute work. In San Antonio, Wolfe created his own form of institute—the Summer School of Methods—and required city teachers to attend his autonomous program, free from official state department prescriptions.⁶⁰⁸

Thus, the control of institutes' curriculum was, in many cases, not in the hands of the board of education, in the hands of the state or territorial legislature, nor in the hands of individual teachers. Control was, for the most part, wielded by individual superintendents, both at the city and county level. Detractors sometimes complained about the practice, calling superintendents “monopolists” and “in-breeders” of pedagogical ideas.⁶⁰⁹ Nevertheless, individual superintendents continued to choose books for institute study and to invite individuals to offer lectures. Moreover, many superintendents organized institutes, or, hand-picked institute conductors to organize and administer sessions. In much the same way, Historian William Deverell urged scholars not to perpetuate the myth of the freedom

⁶⁰⁵ *Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of New Mexico for the Years 1910-1911 and 1911-1912* (Santa Fe: New Mexican Printing Company, 1918), 49.

⁶⁰⁶ F.M Bralley, “County Institutes”, *The Texas School Journal* 29.1 (1911): 32-34.

⁶⁰⁷ R.B. Cousins, “The Institute Work for 1907-1908”, *Texas School Magazine* 10.7 (1907): 11-13.

⁶⁰⁸ “A Beacon of Educational Progress”, *San Antonio Daily Express*, June 7, 1903.

⁶⁰⁹ H.T. Musselman, “What of the County Institute in Texas?” *The Texas School Journal* 34.3 (1916): 25-36.

of the Western Frontier, but, instead, to look at issues of power in the history of the American West.⁶¹⁰ One application of Deverell's statement to the professional development of teachers is the examination of power in terms of the regulation of the balance between access and control. Power, in this conception, manifests itself in Southwestern teacher's institutes during the Progressive Era. Specifically, these teachers' institutes cannot be disassociated from individual superintendents who organized and directed the institutes. Individual superintendents could, and did, use institutes as a means of control, pushing personal ideologies and pedagogical preferences onto their teachers.

PLURALITY OR ASSIMILATION?

Texas administrators and policymakers segregated teachers into white and colored institutes. This practice was not unusual for southern states during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries; Alabama, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia, among others, held separate institutes for African-American teachers.⁶¹¹ In Houston, at least, African-American teachers seemed to have the latitude to address topics, at will, that specifically addressed African-American education in Texas. No data on separate institutes for colored teachers exists in Colorado, Arizona and New Mexico. Likely, this is a direct result of the relatively low-population of African-Americans in these states during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

⁶¹⁰ William Deverell, "Fighting Words: The Significance of the American West in the History of the United States", *Western Historical Quarterly*, 25.2 (1994), 187.

⁶¹¹ "Teacher Institutes", *Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education*. No. 2 1885

Historian Gilbert Gonzalez asserted that the marginalization of Mexican children was a visible element in Southwestern public schools during the first half of the twentieth-century.⁶¹² He argued that the segregation of Chicano students was a pervasive political and economic policy that perceptibly manifested itself in policymaking, curriculum, administration and school facilities. Regarding teachers' institutes in the American Southwest, this study does not offer sufficient data to support Gonzalez assertions. Teachers' institutes in Texas, Colorado, and—for the most part—Arizona, did not focus on the assimilation and marginalization of Mexican children in *visible* ways. Discussions about children of Mexican descent, simply, did not appear in much of the data collected. In fact, the teachers' institute story in New Mexico offers an incongruity in terms of Gonzalez' claim. In New Mexico, some county institutes were offered in both Spanish and English. Moreover, administrators urged teachers to become fluent in both languages. Teachers' of Mexican descent took institute leadership positions in all parts of the territory, and Santa Fe institute content included strategies for bilingual instruction. In terms of language, at least, early New Mexican teachers' institutes offered a sort of cultural pluralism. Lynne Marie Getz, in *The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850-1940*, supported the idea that the Spanish language was an important part of New Mexican society during the early territorial period.⁶¹³ “As first a

⁶¹² Gilbert. G. Gonzalez, *Chicano Education in the Era of Segregation* (Philadelphia: The Balch Institute Press, 1990).

⁶¹³ Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, 19.

Spanish colony and then as a Mexican province,” Getz explained, “New Mexico’s political and cultural circumstances nurtured different institutional patterns”.⁶¹⁴

Importantly, the bulk of Gonzalez’ study targets the years 1910-1950. This study, instead, focuses on an earlier time period, 1880-1920, before segregation became widespread in the Southwestern United States. During these earlier years, Anglo ethnocentrism in state-sponsored teachers’ institutes was not an outwardly visible part of in-service curriculum. This began to change in the latter part of the second decade of the twentieth-century, as centralization and Americanization of the public school system came to the forefront during World War I.⁶¹⁵ Matthew Davis asserted that “assimilation in the Southwest United States has been too narrowly cast”.⁶¹⁶ Certainly, that seems to be the case in relation to teachers’ institutes during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

CREATING LOYALTY THROUGH AN ESPRIT DE CORPS

In all five of these cities under study, institutes provided teachers with an outlet for socialization. These interactions took many forms. For example, they included lunchtime discussions at a local institute in Denver,⁶¹⁷ a night at the

⁶¹⁴ Getz, *Schools of Their Own*, 2.

⁶¹⁵ See, for example, O.L. Davis, Jr. “Schooling in the Service of the State: Great War Foreshadowing of Changed American Educational Purpose”, Eds. Lynn M. Burlbaw and Sherry L. Field, *Explorations in Curriculum History* (Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2005): 311-328; Guadalupe San Miguel, “The Status of Historical Research on Chicano Education”, *Review of Educational Research*, 57.4 (1987): 473.

⁶¹⁶ Davis, Matthew, “No Simple Americanizers”.

⁶¹⁷ “Denver to Have One of the Best Summer Schools in the Country, *The Denver Post*, June 11, 1905.

Phoenix opera house,⁶¹⁸ a moonlit hayride in Santa Fe,⁶¹⁹ a garden party in San Antonio,⁶²⁰ and a Women's Club reception in Houston.⁶²¹ Teachers enjoyed these opportunities to interact with colleagues.⁶²² These practices appear consistent with Dick Bryan Clough's interpretation about teachers' institutes in Tennessee. He remarked that "teachers in attendance at the state's institutes benefited from the social aspect of the institute as much as from the professional knowledge gained".⁶²³ Certainly, institutes in the American Southwest provided teachers with a reliable social network. Indeed, this function of the institute took on particular importance for teachers in the American Southwest who were isolated geographically, situated in small pockets of population separated by vast distances.

An additional reason for including social events in the curriculum of Southwestern teacher institutes seems obvious. Institutes helped to increase teachers' loyalty to a particular district through the creation of a feeling of *esprit de corps*. Through participation in social activities, teachers built allegiance—not only to individual schools, but also to the city, the county schools and the state. One early twentieth-century Denver principal described this characteristic as "professional loyalty". "It is here that the principal must develop the *esprit de corps*", he

⁶¹⁸ "Directors of the Youth: Teachers of Arizona in Annual Session", *The Arizona Republican*, December 29, 1896.

⁶¹⁹ "County Teachers' Institute Has Fine Programs", *The Santa Fe New Mexican*, June 25, 1918.

⁶²⁰ "School of Methods: Attendance and Interest of Teachers is Growing Each Day", *San Antonio Daily Light*, Thursday, May 31, 1906.

⁶²¹ Free Kindergarten Association, *Annual Report* (Houston: Women's Club of Houston, 1904), 7.

⁶²² "An Evening Session", *The Arizona Republican*, December 21, 1900.

⁶²³ Clough, "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee," 212.

explained, “it is here that the principal must arouse enthusiasm for the ideal to enable teachers to enter fully into the plans and policy of the superintendent”.⁶²⁴

Institutes fostered sentiments not only during evening events, but also through collaborative activities scheduled during the institute day. In Phoenix, for example, teachers worked together on educational exhibits for display at the territorial fair which was open during institute week. Arizona superintendents hoped that this activity would increase territory teacher’s pride and devotion for Arizona education.⁶²⁵ San Antonio city institutes encouraged teachers to engage in community-building public service projects, ones like mending locks, painting fences, and repairing broken sidewalks.⁶²⁶ In Santa Fe, teachers joined to sing songs like “Dear Old Institute” that carried with it a spirit of allegiance:

Dear Old Institute⁶²⁷

In a city in the west, where Indians used to roam,
Where peaks look down, with crowns as white as foam,
Stands an Institute, with students not a few—
Behold in them our classmates of Old New Mexico.

Chorus: We’ll rally, we’ll rally,
The old friends and the new;
A band of jolly students
Cheer the institute

Smite ev’ry foe, that rears an ugly head,
Clasp ev’ry friend, whose title clear is read!
Old ones are the best, but we welcome all the new;
For friends are always loyal to the Institute.

⁶²⁴ *Sixteenth Annual Report of School District Number 1 in the City and County of Denver, Colorado, For the Year Ending on June Thirteenth, 1919* (Denver: Board of Directors, 1919), 123.

⁶²⁵ “Seventh Annual Arizona Fair”, *The Arizona Teacher*, 2.2 (1911), 108.

⁶²⁶ Charles Hanus, “That All May Learn: A History of Curriculum in San Antonio Public Schools to 1925” (PhD Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1997), 154.

⁶²⁷ “Institute Song”, *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 13.1, September 1, 1916.

In a region of the country in which superintendents scarcely were able to fill open positions with teachers, building fidelity was not only important. It seemed necessary. Teachers' institutes in the American Southwest provided a means by which teachers, once employed, would remain loyal to their system.

A CARROT OR A STICK?

State and Territorial Boards of Education in the American Southwest differed in the ways that they enforced teacher attendance at institutes. The easiest means to ensure a high enrollment was to mandate attendance through legislative action. In both Texas and Arizona, state law required that teachers participate in institutes. In Arizona, county superintendents "docked the pay" of truant teachers. In Texas, teachers who failed to attend county institutes could lose their teaching certificates. Importantly, both Arizona and Texas eventually paid teachers their regular salary for attendance at teachers' institutes.

In the Territory of New Mexico, laws did not mandate attendance at teachers' institutes. Amado Chaves, the first Territorial Superintendent of Public Instruction in New Mexico, seriously wanted the territory's teachers to attend teachers' institutes out of a sense of intrinsic motivation. He believed that teachers should attend "from choice and not compulsion".⁶²⁸ His desire, however, failed to flower. Attendance at Santa Fe's annual county institutes was routinely poor and teachers who missed these meetings would file flimsy excuses including that of feigning illness.

⁶²⁸ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of New Mexico, 1898*, 9.

Although, in 1908, Territorial Superintendent James E. Clark imposed stricter standards for the acceptance of excuse notes, only a few punitive actions were available options to a superintendent without legislative support.

In Colorado, also, teachers were not officially required to attend the summer normals. A teacher who failed to attend an institute, explained Colorado Superintendent of Instruction Helen Loring Grenfell (1899-1905), suffered “only in a loss of opportunity for increased knowledge and culture”.⁶²⁹ However, attendance at Denver institutes was consistently high year after year. Several possibilities can help explain this high attendance. Colorado offered incentives for teachers who attended annual institute programs. First, some institutions of higher education in Colorado, like the State Normal School in Greeley and the State Normal School in Gunnison, gave credits for institute participation.⁶³⁰ Second, teachers who attended the summer normal institute received a five per cent bonus on one certification examination during the year following their institute attendance. Additionally, several Denver County Superintendents, like Lilian A. Field sent personal letters to district teachers that pointed out the benefits of the examination bonus. An example is Superintendent Field’s letter to Siddle Rice:

⁶²⁹ *Twelfth Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado of December 1900*, 13.

⁶³⁰ Minutes from the Joint Meeting of County Superintendents, Institute Conductors and Instructors and the Education Council, Denver, Colorado, March 29-April 1, 1916, State Board of Education Minutes, Colorado State Archives.

April 5, 1907
Miss Siddle Rice
2226 California Street, Denver

Dear Miss Rice:

Had you attended our Institute last year I could have added 5% to your average which would have entitled you then to a Second Grade Certificate. My advice to you would be to attend while it is in session this year from June 10th to June 21st.

Lilian A. Field⁶³¹

The superintendent was not beyond a modicum of “arm-twisting” to increase attendance at the annual institute.

In the absence of state legislation mandating teacher attendance, the Denver schools were much more successful than were Santa Fe schools in their encouragement of teacher participation in regularly scheduled professional development. Certainly, higher education credits and bonus points on certification exams constituted tempting incentives. That Denver teachers attended institutes from intrinsic motivation would distort the evidence. Still, that system’s experience appears to confirm the aphorism that a carrot was much more successful than a stick.

THE PUSH TOWARDS STATEHOOD

During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, Arizona and New Mexico were organized as territorial governments, whereas Texas (1845) and Colorado (1876) long had been states. During this early period of the Progressive Era, both Arizona and New Mexico pushed towards statehood. “The Star Spangled Banner”, read one 1891 Arizona newspaper tagline, “Should Float Over Every

⁶³¹ Lilian A. Field to Miss Siddle Rice, Denver, Colorado, April 5, 1907, Colorado State Archives, Arapahoe/Denver County Records

School House”.⁶³² For a number of years, the New Mexican government published a list of “Comparisons Showing Growth”, that illustrated the optimistic ways that schools in New Mexico fared in relation to neighboring states and territories.⁶³³ Beneath this assertive push, however, lay an uncertainty about the achievement of statehood, especially for New Mexico. In a 1908 report, for example, New Mexican Territorial Superintendent James E. Clark lamented that New Mexican public schools “have heretofore been greatly misunderstood and much underrated” by the United States federal government.⁶³⁴ Indeed, the prevailing national sentiment at the turn-of-the-twentieth century was against New Mexico’s entry to the union. This negative outlook was in many ways related to education; opponents of New Mexican statehood claimed that the territory’s educational system failed to produce citizens literate in the English language.⁶³⁵

To be sure, Arizona and New Mexico needed strong public school systems with high quality, professionally trained teachers in order to be strong contenders for admittance into the Union. Territorial policymakers acknowledged the role that teachers’ institutes played in strengthening the educational system. Indeed, the congressional committee on statehood, on one example, visited teachers’ institutes in Arizona.⁶³⁶ Teachers at institutes discussed political issues that related to admission to the United States as a state. Arizona teachers, for example, vehemently disagreed

⁶³² “Teachers’ Institute: The Second Day’s Session An Interesting One”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 23, 1891.

⁶³³ See, for example, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of New Mexico 1908*, 18-20.

⁶³⁴ *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of New Mexico 1908*, 21.

⁶³⁵ Jane C. Atkins, “Who Will Educate: The Schooling Question in Territorial New Mexico, 1846-1911,” PhD dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 1982.

⁶³⁶ “Teachers at Tucson”, *The Arizona Republican*, January 1, 1900.

with any resolution that would combine the territories of Arizona and New Mexico into one state. “No greater or more deplorable calamity”, institute teachers stated in 1904, “could befall our educational interests than their merger with those of New Mexico”.⁶³⁷

Looking at the teachers’ institute from the perspective of statehood, Texas and Colorado needed not to imitate the Northeast if they found alternative approaches more appealing. Houston city institutes took a unique approach of emphasizing theoretical work, the San Antonio School of Methods followed the ideology of Progressivism, and Denver summer normal institutes freed themselves from the pressures of certification test preparation. However, both the Arizona and the New Mexico territories needed to mirror teachers’ institutes in the greater United States in order that they market themselves for admission to statehood. “Yet”, Western Historian Gerald Nash explained, “the products of New England or New York could never be duplicated exactly in the natural environment of the West for its newness encouraged flexibility and experimentation”.⁶³⁸ Nevertheless, Arizona and New Mexico attempted to develop their institutes to conform with conventional standards when they should have experimented. In Arizona, the attempted conformity was not a great hindrance although the push towards centralization deprived some rural teachers from regular professional development. In New Mexico, however, the traditional county institute system struggled without financial and legislative support. Quite possibly, the exploration of alternative forms of

⁶³⁷ “The Institute Ends”, *The Arizona Republican*, December 41, 1904.

⁶³⁸ Gerald Nash, *The American West in the Twentieth Century: A Short History of an Urban Oasis* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973), 50.

teachers' institutes may have helped New Mexican professional development during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries.

MYTH-BREAKING THE AMERICAN SOUTHWEST

As earlier noted, the United States Bureau of Education advocated decentralized in-service education programs for city school systems during the late-nineteenth century. Simply, it promoted “home-trained” teachers.⁶³⁹ Certainly, regional modifications of local institute systems enabled instructors better to meet the needs of educators. Leo Ray DeLong, in his 1930 study on city school institutes in Pennsylvania, advanced the conclusion that city institutes enabled “closer professional contacts between instructors and teachers than county institutes”.⁶⁴⁰ In the American Southwest, where expansive geographical terrain limited travel, the importance of providing teachers with quality in-service opportunities close to home was paramount. Most teachers drew such low salaries that they could not afford the “additional expense of traveling and board” that came from traveling to distant teachers' institutes.⁶⁴¹ Still, although both Houston and San Antonio provided substantial and successful local forms of teachers' institutes, a state-wide push towards centralized meetings occurred in Texas. One reason for this push, of course, lay in the progressive education movement that pervaded during the turn-of-the-twentieth century. This movement argued for state centralization of educational

⁶³⁹ Philbrick, *City School Systems in the United States*, 41.

⁶⁴⁰ DeLong, *City School Institutes in Pennsylvania*, 84.

⁶⁴¹ Hiram Hadley, New Mexico Superintendent of Public Instruction to County Superintendents of Schools and Other Active Educators in New Mexico, Santa Fe, April 1, 1905, New Mexico Department of Education Records, New Mexico State Library.

control in order to achieve consolidation of rural school districts.⁶⁴² This Texas initiative, however, failed.

In regard to centralization, the experience of these five Southwestern city school districts differed substantially from that which Potter observed in North Dakota. In that region, teachers' institutes became increasingly localized.⁶⁴³ Similarly, Tennessee abandoned central institutes in favor of "conducting numerous institutes across the state".⁶⁴⁴ One reason among others appears to explain their different progressions. In the Southwest, the push towards centralization appears to have been practical or financial rather than ideological. Counties that pooled their finances could afford improved resources and more lecturers than individual counties that hosted institutes on their own.⁶⁴⁵ Importantly, although centralized institutes may have helped state and territorial governments financially, they likely placed individual teachers at a financial disadvantage. Teachers who attended centralized institutes had to pay money for travel, and in some cases, room and board. In this case, then, the needs of the state outweighed the needs of the teacher.

Probably, if joint institutes had been established in the Dakotas and Tennessee, these areas would have enjoyed similar benefits to those known in cities of the American Southwest. The financial explanation does not account satisfactorily for the regional differences. A possibly better explanation is regionally specific to the West and to the subregion of the Southwest. Western historian

⁶⁴²Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961).

⁶⁴³ Potter, "Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers", 105.

⁶⁴⁴ Clough, "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee", 1875-1915, 210.

⁶⁴⁵ "County Institutes and Teachers' Meetings", *New Mexico Journal of Education*, 15.5 (1919), 23.

William Deverell urged historians not to think of the West as a special case, nor to assume that the area is easily representative of the nation as a whole. “Exceptionalism assumes Western isolation”, he explains, “a belief that the West, by geography, history, and circumstance, is somehow outside of America. But, of course, except for a mountain range or two, the West is not separate from the rest of the nation, nor has it ever been”.⁶⁴⁶ Between these two extremes, Deverell believed, is the idea that the American West represents a regional variation of the national American identity.

One enduring myth of the historical American West is the individualized Western hero, one who is “free to come and go as he pleases, moving in and out of society with careless ease, his lack of deep-seated social obligations accentuating the individualism that controls his every act”.⁶⁴⁷ On the other hand, reality separated itself differently from myth in Western cities. Urban areas in the American Southwest served not to substantiate myth, but, instead, as community builders: “conduits” and “collectors” that displayed a unified “urban consciousness”.⁶⁴⁸ Far from the myth of frontier exceptionality, Southwestern cities operated as what Nash called urban “oases” that collected human activity rather than fragmenting it.⁶⁴⁹ Within this frame, the push towards centralization of teachers’ institutes perfectly fits the context of the urban American Southwest, certainly during the late-nineteenth

⁶⁴⁶ William Deverell, “Fighting Words”, 190.

⁶⁴⁷ Fred Erisman, “The Enduring Myth and the Modern West”, *Researching Western History: Topics in the Twentieth Century*, ed. Gerald D. Nash and Richard W. Etulain, *Researching Western History: Topics in the Twentieth Century* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1997), 169.

⁶⁴⁸ Bradford Luckingham, *The Urban Southwest: A Profile History of Albuquerque, El Paso, Phoenix, Tucson* (El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1982), 133.

⁶⁴⁹ Nash, *The American West in the Twentieth Century*, 5.

and early-twentieth centuries. The role of the teachers' institute was to strengthen the urban oasis by providing teachers with a centralized means by which they could explore new pedagogical ideas and educational content.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE TEACHER'S INSTITUTE

Teachers' institutes should be of considerable importance to historians of education. During the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries, teachers in the American Southwest had multiple opportunities for free and low-cost professional development, most of which was mandatory. These institutes both followed national trends and targeted local issues. Many school superintendents in that region used these meetings to assert personal ideologies and teaching agendas. In all likelihood, these institutes helped shape teacher's perceptions of their profession. Consequently, educational histories of a school, a district or a region cannot be complete without consideration of the teacher's institutes regularly held in the area. Likewise, educational biographers must be cognizant of the politics and ideology governing the professional development of individuals as they engage the task of researching and crafting biographies of the region's educators.

This study has shown that details regarding the content, the structure and the policies of teacher's institutes exist in archives and repositories across the county. In addition to histories of individual school systems and educational biographies, additional research on teachers' institutes might relate other topics and concerns. Such concerns, for example, might target relationships of institutes to new

curriculum emphases in schools, relationships of institutes to the flowering of higher education in the region (both specific colleges for teachers and other colleges and universities of with teacher education components), and the relationships of institutes to pre-service education programs. As additional primary sources (e.g. diaries, scrapbooks, photographs) become available, even richer accounts or early teachers' institutes may be crafted. All of this work can and will contribute to understanding a major aspect of the social history of the American Southwest—how schooling took hold and prospered in the region.

EPILOGUE

So, what of the “peripatetic teachers’ institute”? How do institutes across the American Southwest “fit” with the metaphors I suggested in the Prologue? Certainly, this study supports my original hypothesis that the “peripatetic normal school” is a mixture of different metaphors of itinerancy. Still, I have been surprised to recognize that each type of institute in each city had its own characteristic feel and form. In Houston, certainly, city institutes were like bookmobiles. They brought texts and theories to practicing teachers. In San Antonio, institutes were not unlike rock-star tours. They brought nationally famous educators to the teaching corps and to the community. They also provoked controversy. Summer institutes in Denver exhibited a wide-variety of foci, like peddler’s offerings of a smattering of methods, subject matter, inspiration, and philosophy. In Santa Fe, county institutes may be compared to blood-banks, attempting to bring essential elements from the American Northeast to a nascent school system, struggling for independence in the desert Southwest. The joint county institutes in Phoenix, while certainly not carnivals, truly did feature annual exhibitions—both at the high school and at the Arizona Territorial Fair. The idea of a “peripatetic” teachers’ institute carries with it colorful metaphors even if they remain exaggerated and incomplete.

In time, I would like to revisit the poem “Two Views of an Institute”, printed in the Prologue of this study. The poem implies that most teachers only begrudgingly attended institutes. Other teachers, those who enjoyed their time and

learning, were the ones who had been appointed to be teacher leaders and institute conductors. How accurate is this characterization? I was disappointed, as a matter of fact, not to have found any significant first-person accounts from teachers that mention teachers' institutes during this time period in the Southwest. Unfortunately, my general question cannot be answered in the absence of a series of additional primary sources that clearly express individual Southwestern teachers' feelings. However, I have examples of such accounts from other parts of the country (e.g. a letter from a teacher written about an institute in Ithaca, New York and a newly published diary from a teacher in Delaware County, New York). Surely, I will find additional sources as I continue my journey as an educational historian.

This study answers several important, mainly structural, questions about the provision, content and policies of Southwestern teachers' institutes and offers several conclusions which should launch other studies. Now that this study is available as a framework, I think that the door is now open for subsequent projects to identify and compile primary sources from different places in the United States that express the reactions of individual teachers to teachers' institutes that they experienced. I would like to see research that probes the experiences of lecturers who traveled on the "institute circuit". Increased understanding of teachers' institutes as one element of in-service teacher education is available. It constitutes—for others and for me—an invitation to continue personal journeys of exploration toward increased awareness of the nature of professional development in education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books, Articles and Presentations

- Abbott, Carl. "Plural Society in Colorado: Ethnic Relations in the Twentieth Century." *Phylon* 39.3 (1978).
- Andrews, Lorin. "The Report of the Executive Committee of the State Teachers' Association for 1851." In the *Ohio Journal of Education Volume 1*. Columbus: Scott and Bascom, 1852).
- Apple, Michael. *Teachers and Texts: A Political Economy of Class and Gender Relations in Education*. New York: Routledge, 1989.
- Barth, Gunther. *Instant Cities: Urbanization and the Rise of San Francisco and Denver*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1975.
- Bates, Samuel P. *Lectures on Mental and Moral Culture*. New York: A.S. Barnes and Company, 1873.
- Berman, Barbara. "Business Efficiency, American Schooling, and the Public School Superintendency: A Reconsideration of the Callahan Thesis." *History of Education Quarterly* 23.3 (1993).
- Björk, Lars and John Keedy. "Politics and the Superintendency in the USA: Restructuring In-Service Education." *Journal of In-Service Education* 27.2 (2001).
- Blanton, Carlos Kevin. *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836-1981*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2004.
- Blount, Jackie M. *Destined to Rule the Schools: Women and the Superintendency, 1873-1995*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998.
- Bobbitt, John Franklin. *The San Antonio Public School System: A Survey Conducted by J.F. Bobbitt*. San Antonio: The San Antonio School Board, 1915.
- Bolam, Ray and Agnes McMahon. "Literature, Definitions and Models: Towards a Conceptual Map." In *International Handbook on the Continuing Professional Development of Teachers*, edited by Christopher Day and Judyth Sachs. Maldenhead: Open University Press, 2004.
- Bryant, Jr. I. *The Development of the Houston Negro Schools*. Houston: Informative Publishing Company, 1934.

- Bullough, Jr, Robert and Craig Kridel. "Workshops, In-service Teacher Education and the Eight-Year Study." *Teachers and Teacher Education* 19 (2003).
- Burlbaw, Lynn M. "Teacher Testing—Could You Pass the Test?". Paper presented at the Mid-America Conference on History, September 19-21, 2002, Fayetteville, Arkansas.
- Burlbaw, Lynn M., Heather Caldwell, Jennifer Moldonato-Castillo and Michelle Fernandez, "The Superintendent Project: Women Educators as State Superintendents of Public Instruction". Paper presented at the Midwest History of Education Society, October 21-22, 2005, Chicago, Illinois.
- Bury, John C. *The Historical Role of Arizona's Superintendent of Public Instruction: Volume 1*. Flagstaff: Northern Arizona, 1974.
- Corcoran, Thomas B., Clair Passantino and Gail B. Gerry. *Mapping Professional Development Opportunities: A Pilot Study of Two Subjects in Three Regions in Kentucky*. Lexington: Partnership for Kentucky Schools, 2001.
- Cowart, N.S. "Normal Schools of the New State." *The Elementary School Teacher* 8.1 (1907).
- Cremin, Lawrence. *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education*. New York: Vintage Books, 1961.
- Davies, Scott. "The Paradox of Progressive Education: A Frame Analysis." *Sociology of Education* 75.4 (2002).
- Davis, Matthew. "No Simple Americanizers: Three Early Anglo Researchers of Mexican-American Education", *The Educational Forum* (Winter 2001).
- Davis, Matthew and O.L. Davis, Jr. "Elma Neal, The Open Door Readers, and Mexican American Schooling in San Antonio, Texas." *American Educational History Journal* 28, 2001.
- Davis, Jr., O.L. "Action as Part of Advocacy: Advancement of Progressive Education Practices by Professional Associations." *American Educational History Journal* 32.1 (2005).
- _____. "Schooling in the Service of the State: Great War Foreshadowing of Changed American Educational Purpose", In *Explorations in Curriculum History*, edited by Lynn M. Burlbaw and Sherry L. Field, Greenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing, 2005.

- DeLong, Leo Ray, *City Institutes in Pennsylvania: A Study of the Development and Administration of the Program of In-Service Education of Teachers*. York, PA: The Maple Press Company, 1930.
- Deverell, William. "Fighting Words: The Significance of the American West in the History of the United States." *Western Historical Quarterly* 25.2 (1994).
- Dewey, John. *Democracy and Education*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1916.
- Doughty, William. *Recommendations Regarding Public Education in Texas for Consideration of the Governor of Texas and the 34th Legislature*. Austin: Von Boeckmann-Jones, Company 1915.
- Eby, Frederick. *The Development of Education in Texas*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925.
- _____. *Education in Texas: Source Materials*. Austin: The University of Texas at Austin, 1921.
- Education in Colorado: 1861-1885: A Brief History of the Early Educational Interests of Colorado, Together with a History of the State Teachers' Association, and Short Sketches of Private and Denominational Institutions*. Denver: News Printing Company, 1885.
- Erisman, Fred. "The Enduring Myth and the Modern West." In Gerald D. Nash and Richard W. Etulain, *Researching Western History: Topics in the Twentieth Century*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1977.
- Feiman-Nemser, Sharon, and Jane Remillard. "Perspectives on Learning to Teach." In *The Teacher Educator's Handbook*, edited by Frank B. Murray. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1996.
- Fehrenbach, T. "San Antonio, Texas." *The Handbook of Texas Online*. <<http://www.tsha.utexas.edu/handbook/online/articles/view/SS/hds2.html>>
- Gammel, H.P.N. *The Laws of Texas 1822-1897*. Austin: Gammel Book Company, 1898.
- Gamson, David. "District Progressivism: Rethinking Reform in Urban School Systems, 1900-1928." *Paedagogica Historica* 39.4 (2003).
- Getz, Lynne Marie. *Schools of Their Own: The Education of Hispanos in New Mexico, 1850-1940*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.

- Goodlad, John, Roger Soder, and Kenneth A. Sirotnik. *Places Where Teachers Are Taught*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1990.
- Gonzalez, Gilbert. *Chicano Education in the Era of Segregation*. Philadelphia: The Balch Institute Press, 1990.
- Goode, William J. "The Theoretical Limits of Professionalism," In *The Semi-Professions and Their Organization*, edited by Amitai Etzioni, (New York: Free Press, 1969): 291-292.
- Gray, William S. "Interrelations of Training for Service and In Service." In *Preparation and Improvement of Teachers; A Report of a Conference Held at Northwestern University, October 28-29, 1932*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University School of Education, 1932.
- Hall, S. H. "Suggestions on the County Institute." *The Virginia Journal of Education* 3.2 (1909).
- Herbst, Jurgen. *And Sadly Teach: Teacher Education and Professionalism in American Culture*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1989.
- Hertzog, Walter Scott. *State Maintenance for Teachers in Training*. Baltimore: Warwick and York, 1921.
- Hoban, Gary and Galen Erickson. "Dimensions of Learning for Long-term Professional Development: Comparing Approaches from Education, Business and Medical Contexts." *Journal of In-Service Education* 30.2 (2004).
- Howsam, Robert B, Dean C. Corrigan, George W. Denemark, and Robert J. Nash. *Educating a Profession: Report of the Bicentennial Commission on Education for the Profession of Teaching of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education*. Washington: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, 1976.
- Hunt, David E. "Inservice Training as Persons-In-Relation." *Theory Into Practice* 17.3 (1978).
- Kelly, Phillip P. and G. William McDiarmid. "Decentralisation of Professional Development: Teachers' Decisions and Dilemmas." *Journal of In-Service Education* 28.3 (2003).
- Kerlinger, Fred N. "Progressivism and Traditionalism: Basic Educational Attitudes." *The School Review* 66.1 (1958).
- Kersey, Harry A. "Michigan Teachers' Institutes in the Mid-Nineteenth Century: A Representative Document." *History of Education Quarterly* 5.1 (1965).

- Kliebard, Herbert. *The Struggle for American Curriculum, 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Knox, Ellis O. "Racial Integration in the Public Schools of Arizona, Kansas and New Mexico." *The Journal of Negro Education*, 23.3 (1954).
- Little, J. W. "Teachers' Professional Development in a Climate of Education Reform." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15.2 (1993).
- Lottich, Kenneth V. "Educational Leadership in Early Ohio." *History of Education Quarterly* 2.1 (1962).
- Lucas, Christopher. *Teacher Education in American: Reform Agendas for the Twenty-First Century*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997.
- Luckey, G.W.A. *The Professional Training for Secondary Teachers in the United States*. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1903.
- Luckingham, Bradford. "The American Southwest: An Urban View." *The Western Historical Quarterly*, 15.3 (1984).
- _____. *Minorities in Phoenix: A Profile of Mexican American, Chinese American and African American Communities, 1860-1992*. Tuscon: The University of Arizona Press, 1994.
- _____. "The Urban Dimension of Western History." In Michael P. Malone, *Historians and the American West*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1983.
- _____. *The Urban Southwest: A Profile History of Albuquerque, El Paso, Phoenix, Tuscon*. El Paso: Texas Western Press, 1982.
- Manuel, Herschel T. "The Mexican Population in Texas." *The Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* 10.1 (1934).
- _____. *Spanish-Speaking Children of the Southwest: Their Education and Public Welfare*. Austin: The University of Texas, 1965.
- Mauck, Laura. *Five Points Neighborhood of Denver*. Chicago: Arcadia Publishing, 2001.
- Mondragón, John B. and Ernest S. Stapleton. *Public Education in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Nash, Gerald D. *The American West in the Twentieth Century: A Short History of an Urban Oasis*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1973.

- _____. *Creating the West: Historical Interpretations: 1890-1990*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991.
- _____. "Research Opportunities in the Economic History of the Twentieth-Century West." *Researching Western History: Topics in the Twentieth Century*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1997.
- Nilsen, Alleen Pace, Margaret Ferry and L.J. Evans. *Dust in Our Desks: Territory Days to the Present in Arizona Schools*. Tempe: ASU Centennial Commission and College of Education Dean Robert T. Stout, 1985.
- Null, Wesley. *A Disciplined Progressive Educator: The Life and Career of William Chandler Bagley*. New York: Peter Lang, 2003.
- Ogren, Christine. *The American State Normal School: An Instrument of Great Good*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005.
- Phillips, Claude A. "The History of Teacher Training in the South." *Peabody Journal of Education* 2.6 (1925).
- Popkewitz, Thomas. "Professionalism in Teaching and Teacher Education: Some Notes on Its History, Ideology and Potential." *Teaching and Teacher Education* 10.1 (1994).
- Peabody Education Fund, *Proceedings of the Trustees of the Peabody Education Fund from Their Original Organization on the 8th of February, 1867, Vol 1*. Boston: Press of John Wilson and Son, 1875.
- Portrait and Biographical Record of Denver and Vicinity, Colorado : Containing Portraits and Biographies of Many Well Known Citizens of the Past and Present, Together with Biographies and Portraits of All the Presidents of the United States*. Chicago: Chapman Publishing Company, 1898.
- Ravitch, Diane. *Left Back: A Century of School Reforms*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Richey, Herman G. "Growth of the Modern Conception of Inservice Education." In *In-Service Education for Teachers, Supervisors and Administrators: The Fifty-Sixth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education Part 1*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Riding, Phil. "Online Teacher Communities and Continuing Professional Development". *Teacher Development* 5.3 (2001).
- Ruiz, Vicki L. "South By Southwest: Mexican Americans and Segregated Schooling, 1900-1950." *OAH Magazine of History* 15 (2001).

- San Miguel, Guadalupe. *Brown, Not White: School Integration and the Chicano Movement in Houston*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press, 2001.
- _____. "The Status of Historical Research on Chicano Education." *Review of Educational Research* 57.4 (1987).
- Seguel, Mary Louise. *The Curriculum Field: Its Formative Years*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Shulman, Lee. "Those Who Understand: Knowledge Growth in Teaching." *Educational Researcher* 5.2 (1986).
- Sibley, Marilyn McAdams. *George W. Brackenridge: Maverick Philanthropist*. Austin: The University of Texas Press, 1973.
- Sprinthal, Norman A., Alan J. Reiman, and Lois Thies-Sprinthal. "Teacher Professional Development." In *The Second Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by John P. Sikula. New York: Macmillan, 1996.
- Stokrocki, Mary. "Historical Research in the Southwest: Ignored and Undervalued." *Studies in Art Education* 42.1 (2000).
- Stoutemyer, J.H. "The Educational Qualifications and Tenure of the Teaching Profession." *The School Review*, 25.4 (1917).
- Tilleman, Harm H. and Jeroen G. M. Imants. "Training for the Professional Development of Teachers." In *Professional Development in Education: New Paradigms and Practices*, edited by Thomas R. Guskey and Michael Huberman. New York: Teacher's College Press, 1995.
- Thomas, Alfred. *Public Education in Territorial Arizona 1864-1912*. Tempe: Arizona State College, 1952.
- Tyack, David and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Toward Utopia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995.
- Urban, Wayne. "Historical Studies of Teacher Education." In *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education*, edited by W. R. Houston. New York: Macmillan, 1990.
- Urban, Wayne. "Organized Teachers and Educational Reform During the Progressive Era: 1890-1920." *History of Education Quarterly* 16.1 (Spring 1976).
- Valentine, Alan. "Teacher Training Versus Teacher Education." *Educational Record* 19 (1938).

- Wanger, Jonathan H. "Improvement In Service." *Educational News Bulletin* 3.5 (1919).
- Warren, Donald. *American Teachers: Histories of a Profession at Work*. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1989.
- Warren, Donald. "Learning From Experience: History and Teacher Education." *Educational Researcher* 14.10 (1985).
- Weiler, Kathleen. *Country Schoolwomen: Teaching in Rural California, 1850-1950* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- Whaley, Charlotte. *Nina Otero-Warren of Santa Fe*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1994.
- Whitney, Frederick Lamson. *The Growth of Teachers In Service: A Manual for the Inexperienced Superintendent of Schools*. New York: The Century Company, 1927.
- Wiley, Tom. *Public School Education in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico Printing Plant, 1965.
- Wilson, Chris. *The Myth of Santa Fe: Creating a Modern Regional Tradition*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico, 1997.
- Zirbes, Laura. "Progressive Training for Elementary Teachers: Teacher Training in Ohio." *Educational Research Bulletin* 8.1 (1921).
- Zook, George F. "Teacher Education As I See It." In *Proceedings of the National Educational Association of 1937* (Washington, D.C.: National Educational Association, 1937).

Theses and Dissertations

- Amerman, Steve. "Making an Indian Place in Urban Schools: Native Americans and Education in Phoenix, 1941-1984." Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 2002.
- Atkins, Jane C. "Who Will Educate: The Schooling Question in Territorial New Mexico, 1846-1911." Albuquerque: New Mexico, 1982.
- Butler, Walter Humphreys. "The County Teachers' Institute." M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1917.

- Clough, Dick Bryan. "A History of Teachers' Institutes in Tennessee, 1875-1915." Ph.D. dissertation, Memphis State University, 1972.
- Crudup, Keith Jerome. "African Americans in Arizona: A Twentieth Century History." Ph.D. dissertation, Arizona State University, 1998.
- Donaldson, Marion Gray. "An Appraisal of the Arizona Education Association and its Contribution to the Improvement of Public Education in Arizona." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Arizona, 1959.
- Elster, Elena Beth. "Students of Teaching: The Professional Development of the Teachers of the Nineteenth Century." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University Teacher's College, 1993.
- Gamson, David. "District by Design: Progressive Education Reform in Four Western Cities, 1900-1940." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 2001.
- Hanus, Charles. "That All May Learn: A History of Curriculum in San Antonio Public Schools to 1925." Ph.D. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1997.
- Hronek, Pamela Claire. "Women and Normal Schools: Tempe Normal, A Case Study, 1885-1925." PhD Dissertation, Arizona State University, 1985.
- Johnson, Johnny. "African American Leadership from 1876-1954: A Study of an Urban School District." E.E.D. Dissertation, Texas Southern University, 1993.
- Keller, Katherine. "A History of Public Education in Texas." M.A. Thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1930.
- Klemme, A. Christian. "The Rise, Fall and Redemption of Oran M. Roberts." MA thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 2004.
- Laugen, Robert Todd. "The Promise and Defeat of the Progressive Public: Reform Politics in Colorado, 1902-1929." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder, 2005.
- Lucero, Herman Robert. "Plessy to Brown: The Education of Mexican Americans in Arizona Public Schools During the Era of Segregation." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Arizona, 2004.
- Lynn, Louis August Andrew. "A History of Teachers' Institutes of Louisiana: 1870-1921." Ph.D. dissertation, Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College, 1961.

- Madien, Marvin. "History of Professional Training of Teachers in Virginia." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Virginia, 1922.
- Niemi, Dorothy Prater. "An Historical Survey of Public Education in Arizona, 1863-1994." Ph.D. dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1995.
- Potter, Sandra Johnson Phillips. "Professional Development of Practicing Public School Teachers: Dakota Territory (1861-1889) and North Dakota (1889-1911)." Ph.D. dissertation, University of North Dakota, 1985.
- Ross, Carmon. "The Status of County Teachers' Institutes in Pennsylvania." Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1922.
- Schiffers, Cecilia Elizabeth. "Education in the San Antonio Express: 1890-1939." M.A. thesis, The University of Texas at Austin, 1940.
- Stone, Charles. "The Teachers' Institute in American Education." Ph.D. dissertation, Stanford University, 1951.
- Stover, Pamela. "Teacher Preparation, Methods and Materials for Music Education in Rural and One-Room Schools in Selected Areas of the Midwest." Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 2003.
- Sullivan, Sean Patrick. "Education Through Sport: Athletics in American Indian Boarding Schools of New Mexico, 1885-1940." Ph.D. dissertation, The University of New Mexico, 2004.
- Yunker, Donna Lee. "Teacher Education in Texas, 1879-1919." PhD. Dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 1964.

Government Documents

- Annual Report of the Superintendent of Public Schools for Maricopa County, Arizona Territory*
- Annual Report of School District Number 1 in the City and County of Denver, Colorado*
- Annual Report of the Houston Independent School District*
- Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of the State of Colorado.*
Denver: The Smith-Brooks Printing Company State Printers, 1876-1920.

- Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction of Arizona.* Phoenix: The H.H. McNeil Company, 1884-1920.
- Biennial Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction to the Governor of New Mexico.* New Mexican Printing Company, 1891-1920.
- Course of Study for County Institutes Prepared by the Territorial Board of Education.* Santa Fe: The New Mexican Printing Company, 1905, 1907.
- Hartman, C. *The Travis County School Annual: A Circular of Information.* Austin: Von-Boeckmann-Jones Company Printers, 1905.
- Lane, J.J. "History of Education in Texas." In *United States Bureau of Education Circular of Information No 2 1903.* Washington, D.C: Government Printing Office, 1903.
- Leu, Elizabeth. *The Patterns and Purposes of Localized Teacher Professional Development Programs.* N.p: U.S. Agency for International Development, 2004.
- Philbrick, John D. "City School Systems in the United States." *Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education. No 1 1885.* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1885.
- Proceedings of the First Annual Session of the Colorado Teachers' Association, Boulder, January 3 and 4, 1877.* Denver: Tribune Stream Printing House, 1877.
- Report of an Inquiry Into the Administration and Support of the Colorado School System: Department of the Interior Bureau of Education Bulletin 1917, no. 5.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1917.
- Ruediger, William C. *Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers In Service. United States Bureau of Education Bulletin No.1* Washington: Government Printing Office, 1913.
- San Antonio Independent School District. *Annual Report of the San Antonio School Board* San Antonio: Press of Clarke Printing Company, 1902-1908.
- School Law of Arizona Territory.* Phoenix: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1885.
- The School Laws Annotated of the State of Colorado,* 1912, 1917. Denver: The Smith-Brooks Company, 1912.

Stewart, P.F. *Bexar County School Annual 1914-1915*. San Antonio: Nic Teng Bookseller Stationer and Printing, 1915).

State of New Mexico Department of Education, *Proposed Program of Procedure Adopted by the Administrative School Officials and Teachers*. Santa Fe: State Department of Education, 1915.

“Teachers’ Institutes.” *Circulars of Information of the Bureau of Education, no 2 1885*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1885.

United States Bureau of Education, *Bulletin No 3, 1911: Agencies for the Improvement of Teachers In Service*. Washington, DC: United States Bureau of Education, 1911.

Weeks, Stephen B. *Public Education in Arizona: Bulletin No. 17 of the Department of the Interior Bureau of Education*. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1918.

White, Alvan N. *Compilation of the Public School Laws of New Mexico, 1903, 1915*. Denver: The W.H. Courtwright Publishing Company.

Woods, L.A. and S.B. McAlister. *Public School Laws*. The State of Texas, 1938.

Newspapers and Periodicals

Arizona Republican

Arizona Teacher

Colorado School Journal

Denver Evening Post

New Mexico Journal of Education

Rocky Mountain Educator

San Antonio Daily Express

San Antonio Daily Light

Santa Fe New Mexican

Texas School Journal

Texas School Magazine

Archival Sources

Aaron Gove Manuscript Collection, Denver Public Library. Denver, Colorado.

AISD Scrapbooks of Clippings, Programs 1881-1953. 11 Volumes. FP D.3 V, The Austin History Center, Austin, Texas.

Arapahoe/Denver County Records, Colorado State Archives. Denver, Colorado.

Education Collection, Fray Angélico Chávez History Library and Photo Archives, Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Hayden Arizona Collection, Arizona State University Library.

Maricopa County School Superintendent Records, Arizona State Library.

New Mexico Department of Education Records, New Mexico State Library. Santa Fe, New Mexico.

Robert Bartow Cousins, Sr., Papers, 1861, 1894-1933. Center for American History, The University of Texas at Austin.

State Board of Education Minutes, Colorado State Archives. Denver, Colorado.

VITA

Melinda “Mindy” Jo Spearman was born in Findlay, Ohio on October 26, 1974, the daughter of Darlene Hagemeyer Spearman and Ralph Leroy Spearman. She grew up in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, where she graduated from Baton Rouge Magnet High School in 1993. In 1996, she studied Classics and Archaeology at the University of Edinburgh, Scotland. In 1997, she received a B.A. in Classics and History from Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas. Mindy earned an M.A. in Classics, with an emphasis in Archaeology, from The University of Texas at Austin in 1999. While studying Archaeology, she excavated in Carthage, Tunisia, Chersonesos, Ukraine, and Metaponto, Italy. After receiving her M.A., Mindy earned a Texas teaching certification from The University of Texas at Austin. She taught 2nd grade for three years at Buda Primary School in Buda, Texas. In 2002, she entered the PhD program in Curriculum Studies at The University of Texas at Austin.

Permanent address: 22010 Mission Hills Lane
Katy, TX 77450

This dissertation was typed by the author.